GOVERNMENT

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT

+ + + + +

PUBLIC HEARING

+ + + + +

TUESDAY

SEPTEMBER 27, 2005

+ + + + +

The Public Hearing convened in Room 1114 South, 441 4^{th} Street, NW, Washington, D.C., 20001, pursuant to notice at 12:30 a.m., Geoffrey H. Griffis, Chairperson, presiding.

BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT MEMBERS PRESENT:

GEOFFREY H. GRIFFIS Chairperson
RUTHANNE G. MILLER Vice-Chairperson
CURTIS ETHERLY, JR. Board Member
JOHN A. MANN, II Board Member (NCPC)

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

KEVIN HILDEBRAND ANTHONY HOOD

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

CLIFFORD MOY BEVERLY BAILEY JOHN NYARKU

Secretary Zoning Specialist Zoning Specialist

D.C. OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL:

SHERRY GLAZER, ESQ. MARY NAGELHAUT, ESQ.

NEAL R. GROSS

OFFICE OF PLANNING STAFF PRESENT:

KAREN THOMAS STEVEN COCHRAN STEVEN MORDFIN

This transcript constitutes the Minutes from the Special Public Hearing held on September 27, 2005.

AGENDA ITEM

CALL TO ORDER:	
Geoffrey Griffis 4	Ŀ
ADDITION NO. 17261 AND ADDITION (\ T.
APPLICATION NO. 17361 - ANC-1D - APPLICATION (
WILLIAM H. MOSLEY, JR AND LISA DOWDEN, 1742 HOBAI STREET, NW	
SIREEI, NW IC)
OFFICE OF PLANNING - MR. MOY	Ė
<u>VOTE - UNANIMOUS</u> 20)
APPLICATION NO. 17363 - ANC-6B - APPLICATION O	
MONOGRAM RENOVATIONS LLC 20)
OPPEGE OF DIAMBITMS MG MILOMAG	_
OFFICE OF PLANNING - MS. THOMAS 26)
VOTE - FIVE TO ZERO)
<u> </u>	
APPLICATION NO. 17365 - ANC-6B - APPLICATION OF KEV	ΙN
<u>R. WEST</u> 34	
OFFICE OF PLANNING - MR. COCHRAN	}
NOTE INDIVIDUE	
<u>VOTE - UNANIMOUS</u> 45)
APPLICATION NO. 17367 - ANC-2D - APPLICATION (ЭF
HURTEAU PROPERTIES, LTD	
OFFICE OF PLANNING - MR. MORPHIN 113	}

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S 1 2 1:29 P.M. 3 CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Call to order -- is it our morning session. Indeed our morning session of 4 the 27th of September 2005 of the Board of Zoning 5 Adjustment in the District of Columbia. 6 7 is Jeff Griffis, Chairperson. name Joining me today is Ms. Miller, the Vice Chair and Mr. 8 Etherly our esteemed colleague. 9 10 Representing the National Capitol Planning 11 Commission is Mr. Mann and representing the Zoning 12 Commission with us today is Mr. Hood. 13 A very good afternoon to you, Mr. Hood. 14 Copies of today?s hearing agenda Actually, 15 available somewhere in the room. they?re 16 available right behind us on the table. If you 17 entered in on this side, you can pick one up. We can 18 actually Kyle has put them on the other table also for 19 people. 20 As you can see, we are not in our normal 21 hearing room or maybe you have never been before the 2.2 we are under major renovations Board. However, downstairs and we are looking forward to new and 23

better accommodations to serve the public. But in the

meantime, we are making due. We should all take the

24

great opportunity to enjoy the view from the 11th floor of 441. Because let me tell you, it?s pretty spectacular.

But that being said, we?ll get right down to business.

We are normally broadcast live on the Office of Zoning?s website. That is not something that we have capability of today. However, importantly we are being recorded. We?re recorded by a Court Reporter who is sitting with us at the table.

You will note that we may have technical difficulties as we put this all together on a temporary basis, so bear with us and we appreciate everyone?s patience. And we appreciate everyone?s patience in their flexibility of schedule.

We?re going to get through the day very quickly and expeditiously, I do believe.

So, with that in mind, let?s move ahead.

The order of procedure for special exceptions and variances is as follows. We hear from the Applicant in the presentation of their case. We will then hear any Government reports attended to the application. We will then ask if the ANC is present to provide us with their presentation or memo. Then we will go to any persons or parties that are in

2.2

support of the application and hear their testimony.

We will then go to persons or parties in opposition to
an application and hear their testimony.

Finally, we will hear from the Applicant again if they have any rebuttal testimony, witnesses or closing remarks.

Cross examination is permitted by the parties established in the case. The ANC within where the property is located automatic with the party in the case, then therefore will be able to conduct cross examination.

We will close the record on all hearings at the end of today unless we make specific note that we will continue the hearing or that we will keep the record open for specific information.

We will be very specific on both of those instructions. Most importantly, if the record is kept open for specific information, we will make great note of that and we will also indicate exactly when it is to be submitted into the Office of Zoning and therefore into the record.

Very important to understand this aspect because the Board in its deliberations and decisions will base it only on the record that?s created before us today in this public hearing. Attended to that all

2.2

of our proceedings must be carried out in the open and 1 2 before the public and that is in accordance with the 3 Sunshine Act. Our rules, regulations and procedures also 4 5 allow us to enter into Executive Session both during or after a hearing on a case. And that is within the 6 7 parameters of the Sunshine Act also. Let us move very quickly ahead and let me 8 say again a very good afternoon to Ms. Bailey with the 9 Office of Zoning who is with us. Mr. Moy who is 10 attending to other things outside of the room at this 11 12 point. 13 I?m going to ask all those people that are 14 here today that are going to provide testimony before the Board if you would please stand and give your 15 attention to Ms. Bailey. She?s going to swear you in. 16 17 CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Let?s do this. May I ask if you would all solemnly swear or affirm that the 18 testimony you are about to give in the proceedings 19 20 will be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the 21 truth. 2.2 How do you respond? Very well. Thank you Why don?t we have a seat and make 23 all very much. yourselves comfortable. 24

move

ahead

then

And

let?s

25

to

any

1	preliminary matters.
2	Preliminary matters are those which relate
3	to whether a case will or should be heard today. And
4	lack of microphone and recording is not a point of
5	which we will kick you off the schedule. But we will
6	make great accommodations.
7	However, seriously, preliminary matters
8	are a request for a postponement, continuances,
9	withdrawals, or whether proper and adequate notice has
10	been provided.
11	Ms. Bailey, are you aware of any
12	preliminary matters for the Board?s attention at this
13	time?
14	MS. BAILEY: at all. There is a
15	preliminary matter that has to do with monograms
16	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Excellent. Is there
17	any
18	MS. BAILEY: None sir.
19	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Very well. Then
20	there?s no action required by the Board. Very well.
21	Then let?s move ahead then and let me ask
22	if anyone here present has any preliminary matters for
23	the Board?s attention?
24	None being indicated, let?s go ahead and
25	call our first case for today.

1	MS. BAILEY: Application number 17361,
2	William H. Mosley and Lisa Dowden, pursuant to 11 DCMR
3	3103.2, for appearing
4	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Excellent. Thank you
5	very much, Ms. Bailey.
6	Why don?t we have the Applicant come
7	forward. You can have a seat right where the mikes
8	are. Nice and close. We?d like if you try not to
9	throw anything at us because we?re in great range
10	right here.
11	Excellent. And I?m going to ask if you
12	would just state your name and address for the record.
13	MR. MOSELY: William H. Mosely, M-O-S-L-E-
14	Y. 1742 Hobart Street, NW.
15	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Excellent.
16	MR. MOSELY: In the District.
17	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: I?m going to have you
18	pull that microphone off a little bit and then tilt it
19	up towards you and I think that may help a little bit
20	as our transmission goes through.
21	Very well. And as Ms. Bailey has
22	indicated, of course, you are here for 1742 Hobart
23	Street, NW. It is in the R-4 District and this is a
24	Special Exception under 223.
25	MR MOSFI.V. Vec

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Why don?t we just open it up for a quick opening statement if you have. I think the record is very sufficient in this and we will go right to questions. But let me let you have an opportunity to address the Board.

MR. MOSELY: Yes. I?ll just briefly say we?ve been pursuing this for on and off--there were some earlier--initially we applied. I?m not sure what the problems were. Some of our applications were lost a couple of times and we had some other snafus, but we?ve been pursuing this for over a decade. So, I?m hoping this is coming to a conclusion now.

It?s a rather small deck as we?ve redesigned it. Our initial application was for 194 square foot deck. We?ve downsized it by about a third to fit within the maximum lot occupancy requirements.

It?s very in character with the rest of the neighborhood. I submitted some photos which I believe you have, which show that in this range of part of our block most houses have some sort of rear addition, most of them a deck. And I don?t believe anybody from the ANC is here, but the ANC did endorse our application, both when we filed it originally as a variance and then when we changed it to a Special Exception, they also endorsed the application.

2.2

1	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Excellent. Thank you
2	very much.
3	Let me ask, is ANC-1D present today?
4	Anyone from the ANC?
5	Not noting anyone present, you are
6	correct.
7	Very well.
8	Are there initial questions from the
9	Board? Any questions? Clarifications?
10	Ms. Miller.
11	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: No. I don?t
12	know if this is premature but the Office of Planning
13	made a suggestion that you add screening and I?m
14	wondering if you discussed that with the Office of
15	Planning?
16	MR. MOSELY: Screening? You mean a screen
17	like a physical screening?
18	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I should wait
19	for the Office of Planning.
20	MR. MOSELY: I don?t believe I heard that
21	suggestion, but we are open to suggestions if
22	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. We can
23	wait until the Office of Planning addresses it then.
24	You have a copy of their report thought. Is that
25	correct?

	MR. MOSELY: Yes.
2	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. I was
3	referring to page 4. OP believe the Board should
4	require the Applicant to add some type of screening on
5	both sides of the deck above the railing to add a
6	measure of privacy for the adjoining neighbors.
7	MR. MOSELY: Okay. We discussed that.
8	One of our neighbors at 7444 Hobart to get some kind
9	ofsomething that would provide privacy. We?re
10	certainly open to that.
11	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: As far as being
12	in character of the rest of the neighborhood, is there
13	screening like that on other people?s decks?
14	MR. MOSELY: If you?re talking about
15	screening like a mesh screen? I don?t now that
16	there?s anything there. I mean, there?s like lattice
17	work. There is some kind ofmostly they?re usually
18	made of wood. The decks are wooden and whatever kind
19	of barrier or privacy shield is usually wood. But we
20	can do whatever is both in character and benefits the
21	neighbors.
22	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. I?m sure
23	Office of Planning will address it.
24	MR. MOSELY: We?re very flexible on that

thought.

1	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Thank
2	you.
3	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: After 10 years, you
4	probably have a couple of options in this thing drawn
5	up.
6	This also went through historic review.
7	Correct?
8	MR. MOSELY: Yes. Yes.
9	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: And I imagine it was on
10	a consentor?s as it just happens it was in the rear,
11	so that would have to go back to put screening in.
12	Have you had any discussions with your
13	adjacent neighbors about
14	MR. MOSELY: Yes. With both the
15	neighbors on both sides of our house have approved it.
16	Submitted letters and it should be in the record,
17	some of the letters in support.
18	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: And that was as shown,
19	and there were just the rails that are showing, not
20	any sort of large screening?
21	MR. MOSELY: Right. I don?t know if I
22	showed them the actual plans, but I know that our
23	neighbors at 1744 we discussed some kind of privacy.
24	Some kind of barriers. Discussing something that
25	would provide the more privacy because they have a

1 deck. And so that we would work with them to 2 accommodate this. 3 CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Okay. Okay. That seems like it would work to the benefit of everybody. 4 Okay. Any other questions from the Board? 5 Quick clarification? 6 I?11 just state for the record, as I?m not 7 sure that we picked up on everything that we said. 8 But it?s very clear that the initial application that 9 was brought in was for variances. You have amended 10 11 that application and made it into a Special Exception 12 under 223. One of those aspects was to reduce the 13 deck size in order to accommodate the lot occupancy 14 that would fit within the Special Exception. So, with that, let?s move ahead then to 15 the Office of Planning for their report. 16 17 MR. MOORE: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman and members of the Board. I?m John Moore. The Office 18 of Planning is standing on the record to support that 19 Miller?s question, 20 application and to answer Ms 21 talking about lattice screening which answers common 2.2 with the index. The Office of Planning would adapt 23 24 terms of getting the project reduced to a legally 25 acceptable occupancy. At a starting point

T	Applicant must use a model, 1744 and 1 that would be
2	illegal.
3	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Right.
4	MR. MOORE: They?ve already been cited for
5	connecting to it, but we would support that
6	application.
7	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Okay.
8	MR. MOSELY: I appreciate your help I mean
9	to start working with us and advise us.
10	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Excellent. Any
11	questions of the Office of Planning then?
12	Ms. Miller?
13	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Mr. Moore, so
14	would you agree thought that if we require the
15	lattice, he?ll have to go back to Historic
16	Preservation Review Board
17	MR. MOORE: I wouldn?t think so.
18	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: And why is that
19	MR. MOORE: First of all, the lattice is a
20	completely solid structure. You can see through it.
21	Screen it off on the immediate property.
22	I can?t imagine having to go back to HP
23	for something like this simple. I?d be glad to, of
24	course, discuss it in assisting the office, but I?m
25	sure it?s okay.

1	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay.
2	MR. MOORE: When you look at the degree of-
3	-17 block of Hobart, you got a whole myriad of deck
4	options and different kind of screening equipment on
5	some of the decks, but there?s a myriad of things.
6	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Thank
7	you.
8	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Good. Anything else?
9	Any questions? Clarifications? The ANC has not
LO	indicated that they are present. However, they had
L1	submitted in their approval, Exhibit Number 23. We
L2	note that for the record.
L3	I don?t have any other Government agency
L4	reports. We had noted the HPRB had looked at this and
L5	given its consent.
L6	Unless anyone else is aware of any other
L7	agency reports submitted into the record, I think we
L8	can move on.
L9	I would note that we have Exhibit Number
20	24, correspondence in support of the application from
21	1744 and also 1740 Hobart Street.
22	Is anyone here present in regards to 17361
23	that would like to provide testimony today, persons
24	present to provide testimony in support or in
25	opposition?

1	Not noting any indication why don?t we
2	turn out for any questions you might have.
3	Excellent. If we had more time, I?d ask
4	you why it took a decade as we don?t
5	MR. MOSELY: It?s a long story.
6	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Exactly.
7	Let?s go to the one issue of the screening
8	that is one of the basis of recommendations. I don?t
9	think it rises as I?m hearing it, the Office of
10	Planning has the basis of which their recommendation
11	of approval rests. But it?s a good kind of design
12	direction and recommendation.
13	Are you adverse at all or see any
14	difficulty in designing and constructing some sort of
15	screening element on your property line?
16	MR. MOSELY: Not at all. I think that
17	in fact, I think it would be beneficial to the
18	neighbors on all sides and privacy for us.
19	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Okay. And I think it?s
20	sound advice also as it does lend some privacy and use
21	to your deck and the adjacent design of which willI
22	don?t need to prescribe at all but obviously can be
23	working in with the owner and his contractor.
24	Anything else then?
25	Very well. If there?s nothing further, I

approval of application 17361 1 for the 2 addition at 1742 Hobart Street, NW, as amended in the 3 application and as indicated having screening element on the property line. And I would ask for a second. 4 5 MR. MANN: Second. CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Thank you very much, 6 7 Mr. Mann. Other to speak to the motion? 8 I think we can rest very securely first of 9 all on all the submissions that are bringing in our 10 direction in support of the Office of Planning?s 11 12 analysis that goes to the entire test which we haven?t taken the time to do. It is in the record and the 13 14 Board has reviewed it and looked at it substantially. But it does rise to the level of the test of whether 15 16 it would impair any of the light or the air, use and 17 enjoyment of adjacent properties. There?s no evidence in the record at all 18 in this case that would show that there would be that 19 20 type of element as it?s been reduced to Special 21 Exception. Of course, that threshold for approval is 2.2 diminished substantially from the variance itself. I don?t see any reason why we would not 23

I don?t see any reason why we would not approve such exception and obviously we do have a motion for approval. It?s been seconded. I?ll ask

24

1	for any other comments on that.
2	Hearing no other comments from the Board,
3	I would ask for all
4	Yes. Ms. Miller?
5	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I was just
6	wondering why is it that we would not add the
7	requirement for the screening?
8	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Why?
9	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Why?
10	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: We did.
11	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Oh, you did.
12	Oh, I thought you were leaving it up to them.
13	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: That?s what the motion
14	is. We?re not going to design it.
15	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Exactly.
16	With some screening.
17	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: And maybe if we had
18	time we could probablyno. We probably shouldn?t
19	design the darn thing.
20	I think in working with Mr. Moore, I would
21	take him up on the fact that we?re going through just
22	to make sure that this doesn?t get bogged down in
23	preservation review. It?s a very simple detail and I
24	think you can something nice on that and it?s not that
25	long of a linear dimension that would have to be

1	provided.
2	Very well. We do have it before us and
3	seconded. I?d ask for all those in favor signify by
4	saying aye?
5	(AYES)
6	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: And opposed?
7	Mr. Moy? Oh, Ms. Bailey.
8	MS. BAILEY:
9	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Okay. Very well.
10	Well, we?ll note that the vote was taken and it was
11	unanimous in support of the application.
12	I thank you very much. We appreciate your
13	flexibility in finding us today and also finding us at
14	the appropriate time.
15	I don?t see any reason why we?d have to
16	issue a fore order on that unless any Board members
17	have any objections to doing that. We can issue a
18	summary order in this case. Are we okay?
19	(Whereupon, off the record from 1:47 p.m.
20	to 1:51 p.m.)
21	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Is Ms. Bailey being
22	picked up or not on that microphone? Nothing on that
23	one? Very well.
24	If Ms. Bailey was picked up on the
25	microphone what she would say, she?d like to call

application 17363. Is that correct? Is this what I?m looking at? Excellent. Don?t put me in charge. And that is for a variance from the minimum lot area and lot width requirements under subsection 401.3 from the lot occupancy.

I?m going to read this as it was originally put in because this is 63, although it was revised and amended to a Special Exception.

Is that correct? Very well.

The amended application, of course, is the relief under 223 from the regulations, again going to the lot occupancy with lot area provisions in the regulations. And this is for the row dwelling, single-family at premises 1120 and 1122 K. Street, SE.

Okay. Why don?t we turn it over to you. You can just state your name and address for the record and then you can provide the Board with an opening statement.

MEMBER ETHERLY: I will note for the record, Mr. Chair, that this property does fall within the ANC and I do live in fairly close proximity to the property. Literally pass it every day, but I have not had any discussions with the ANC or any of the involved parties regarding this particular application nor do I feel that my familiarity with the immediate

2.2

neighborhood would in anyway compromise my ability to 1 2 sit impartially on the case. But I wanted to make 3 that disclosure for the record. CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Excellent. 4 Thank you 5 very much. Does the Board have any questions of Mr. 6 Etherly and his capability of hearing this case? 7 Does the Applicant have any questions of 8 any objection at 9 Mr. Etherly or all with continuing in hearing this case? 10 11 MR. DAY: No objection at all. 12 CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Thank you very much. 13 don?t see any difficulty then, Mr. Etherly, with your 14 own statements of being able to fairly and completely hear and decide this case. Why don?t we move ahead 15 then and ask the Applicant to introduce himself. 16 17 MR. DAY: My name is Donald Day. I?m principal of Monogram Renovations and the general 18 19 contractors for the project. 20 And what we are doing is we are restoring two row houses located in a historic district. 21 2.2 have worked with the ANC-6. We have worked with the Capitol Hill Historic Society. We have worked with 23 the Office of Planning and we have worked with the 24 25 Historic, HPRB. And we have through a series of

1	working sessions with them, have received an approval
2	from all four of those particular entities.
3	We are renovating the house and we need to
4	add space to the rear which would cause us to exceed
5	the 60 percent limit.
6	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Excellent. Well, there
7	it is.
8	Initially, the application, one was
9	withdrawn, was for the other three lots. Is that
10	correct?
11	MR. DAY: That is correct.
12	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: These are the two lots,
13	28 and 29, which are existing structures. Is that
14	correct?
15	MR. DAY: Yes.
16	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Okay. Very well.
17	Any additional questions from the Board?
18	Ms. Miller?
19	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: In changing from
20	going from variance relief to special exception
21	relief, did you change your plan? I think I read in
22	the file that you said originally that the houses were
23	going to be demolished, but now it says you?re
24	renovating them. So, are youwhat?s happening?
25	MR. DAY: The original was based on some

1	bad information that I had. Originally I was told
2	that the historic district ended at the alley, at
3	essentially 1112 K Street. So, I thought that we were
4	within our right to tea down and rebuild.
5	We discovered very quickly through Emily
6	Paulis that it was not. So, she quickly guided us
7	that we would have to restore the front to original
8	condition and that we would have to offset any
9	addition that went above the existing height to the
10	rear.
11	So, we agreed to offset it 19 feet to the
12	rear, but we do need to, from a business standpoint,
13	need to add more square footage to the house and
14	that?s why we need to add the extended lot usage.
15	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Thank you.
16	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: And for clarity, what
17	is the addition that?s being put onto the house?
18	MR. DAY: The entire house is being
19	renovated and we?re simply moving the rear wall.
20	We?re extending the structure further back into the
21	lot.
22	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Okay. And is that
23	shown anywhere on the documentation about how much the
24	distance is?
25	MR. DAY: Yes. I believe

1	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Do you know
2	approximately?
3	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Is it 9 feet?
4	MR. DAY: Nine feet. Yes. Is the number.
5	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Okay.
6	MR. DAY: And that would be in the
7	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Would be Exhibit 23F.
8	You show it as a dark line adjacent to or rather
9	parallel with the adjacent property and you?re moving
10	this
11	MR. DAY: Yes.
12	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: and the two
13	properties back. And that keeps it still within the
14	lot occupancy allowable for special exception to the
15	223 review.
16	MR. HOOD: Mr. Chairman?
17	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Yes?
18	MR. HOOD: Am I being picked up? I?m all
19	right.
20	Let me just ask the Applicant, Mr. Day?
21	MR. DAY: Yes.
22	MR. HOOD: There?s an alley in the back to
23	the read. Am I correct?
24	MR. DAY: No, sir. There is an alley
25	behind some of the properties. The alley does not

1	extend over to 1120 and 1122. 1120 and 1122 are
2	landlocked.
3	MR. HOOD: Okay. Okay. So, there?s not
4	an access going through? No easement or anything?
5	MR. DAY: No, sir.
6	MR. HOOD: Okay. Thank you.
7	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Well, the logical
8	extension of that is so obviously there is no parking
9	in the rear. Is that correct?
LO	MR. DAY: That?s correct.
L1	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Okay. Very well.
12	Let?s move ahead then. Any other
13	questions at this time for the Applicant?
L4	Anything else you want to point us to?
15	If not, I think it would be appropriate
16	and let?s go to the Office of Planning for their
17	report.
18	MS. THOMAS: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman.
19	Members of the Board. I?m Karen Thomas
20	with the Office of Planning. And we are standing on
21	the record in support of the Applicant?s request and
22	we determined that the additional and renovation
23	project would have minimal effect on light and air.
24	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Very well.
25	Any questions from the Board?

Does the Applicant have any cross
examination of the Office of Planning?
MR. DAY: No. We appreciate
CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Good. Just for
clarification, I don?t recall seeing it aside from the
photographs, but the adjacent property of which these
will be extending out from, it has penetration on the
read. Is that correct? It has windows, the adjacent
properties?
MR. DAY: The adjacent properties. Yes.
CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: And are they occupied
structures at this point?
MR. DAY: Yes. To the east there are four
different properties. To the west there are no other
properties that
CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Right. Which are the
three and then the deeper properties. Right?
MR. DAY: Yes.
CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: And then so on toward
the east towards 12th Street, you?ve talked to those
residents of those structures? They?ve seen the plans
that you?re proposing?
MR. DAY: Yes. We did. I have personally
spoken to two of the four and been unable to reach the
other two and show them plans and have gotten their

1	support for the plans.
2	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Okay. Very well.
3	Let?s move ahead then.
4	You?ve indicated in your opening
5	statement, of course, the other historic aspects of
6	this and that puts in all sorts of other reviews.
7	We do have in the record, if I?m not
8	mistaken, we had the Capitol Hill Historic Society
9	putting in a letter today. Is this a part of this
10	application? Right. Which came into the record today
11	which we?ve reviewed. I don?t have the exhibit number
12	in front of me right not but it is in.
13	Let me ask if 6B is represented today?
14	ANC-6B. Not noting anybody here present to provide
15	the testimony from the ANC, we will note that Exhibit
16	Number 29 is the support of the ANC for the
17	application.
18	Let me ask if there?s anyone else present
19	here, persons present to provide testimony in
20	Application 17363 either in support or in opposition?
21	Either they couldn?t find the room or
22	nobody showed up to testify. So, we can move ahead
23	and give you an opportunity for any closing remarks
24	that you might have.

MR. DAY: I have nothing further.

25

Thank

1	you.
2	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Who is visiting today?
3	Okay.
4	CAMETRICK NESMITH: This is Denise K Smith
5	PT
6	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Okay.
7	CAMETRICK NESMITH: Cametrick Nesmith,
8	PGNR Architects.
9	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: And you were here in
10	case there was any hard hitting design questions from
11	the Board, you would answer them? Okay. Well, I?m
12	sorry we couldn?t come up with those.
13	Very well. If there?s nothing further
14	then. Anything else? Clarification from the Board?
15	It?s pretty clear the record is sufficient on this and
16	I would move approval of Application Number 17363,
17	that is for the special exception under 223 for the
18	presences 1120 and 1122 K Street, SE, similar in the
19	proposed additions in the rear of these historic
20	contributing structure.
21	And I would ask for a second?
22	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Second.
23	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Thank you, Ms. Miller.
24	I think the evidence is clear that this

would not rise to the level of creating any sort of

detriment in light and air flow to the adjacent 1 2 properties nor to the privacy and use of 3 adjacent properties. Nothing has arisen in terms of designs, 4 screening, lighting or materiality in the record for 5 6 us to endeavor to get into in terms of conditioning 7 and so I would move ahead with my support of this motion. 8 Open it up to others if they have any 9 other comments or deliberation on this. 10 Not hearing anything, we do have a motion 11 12 before us and a second. Let me ask for all in favor to signify by saying aye. 13 14 (AYE) CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: 15 And opposed? 16 Abstaining? 17 Very well. We will show that the vote 18 was? Yes. 19 MR. DAY: Is this--20 CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Almost. We will show 21 that the order--the motion was presented by myself. 22 Seconded by Ms. Miller and it was five to zero and I why we wouldn?t waive our rules, 23 see no reason 24 regulations, procedure and issue a summary order on 25 this case, unless there?s any objection from the

2 We?ve noted the support of that from the 3 So, I think we can go ahead and do that. 4 Very well. Thank you very 5 Appreciate your patience with the Board in finding us. And make sure--good. The witness cards go to the 6 7 recorder so he has your correct spelling of the name. And is there anything else for the morning 8 session, Ms. Bailey? 9 10 MS. BAILEY: Nothing more. 11 CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Nothing more for the 12 morning session. Then we can adjourn the morning session of 13 the 27th of September and at the same time I would 14 like to call to order the afternoon hearing of the 15 16 Zoning Adjustment of the District Board of 17 Columbia. My name is Jeff Griffis, Chairperson. Joining me is Ms. Miller, the Vice Chair. 18 And Mr. Representing the National Capitol Planning 19 20 Commission is Mr. Mann. And representing the Zoning Commission is Mr. Hood with us this afternoon. 21 2.2 It is still a beautiful day outside and we are, of course, as everyone here present in the room 23 24 is aware in a different surroundings than normally.

We will ask everyone?s patience again for

25

Board.

all the technical difficulties we might run into, but I think we?re moving very expeditiously ahead.

I will keep my opening remarks to a bear minimum, but it should be known that all proceedings before the Board of Zoning and Adjustments are recorded. They are recorded only in one fashion today and the Court Reporter who is sitting to my right. As you heard, possibly from the morning session, I would ask that you fill out witness cards. Witness cards would be provided to the reporter so that we can have all of the proper transcripts created for this case. You can do that prior to going forward in the case.

I would ask if and when you address the Board to state your name and address for the record.

All proceedings before the Board of Zoning Adjustment are required to be in the open and before the public. That is under the Sunshine Act, our requirement.

The board does enter into Executive Session during and after hearings on the case for review of records and deliberation of records and that is in accordance with our rules, regulations and procedure. And also in accordance with the Sunshine Act.

Our procedure for special exceptions and

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

2.2

1	variances is as follows. We?ll have the Applicant
2	present their case. We will go then to any Government
3	reports attended to the application. The ANC will
4	then provide their report. We will go to persons to
5	give testimony and then finally any conclusion and
6	conclusionary remarks.
7	Ms. Bailey, are you aware of any
8	preliminary matters for the afternoon session for the
9	Board?s attention?
10	MS. BAILEY: Just case specifics.
11	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Case specifics and
12	we?ll take that up with each of the cases.
13	Let me just ask as we have a very small
14	crowd. Were you sworn in?
15	UNIDENTIFIED PERSON: Yes.
16	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Indeed. So, I think
17	we?re ready to go with the afternoon case.
18	Why don?t we call the first case in the
19	afternoon, which would be Case No. 17365, if I?m not
20	mistaken on my own schedule here.
21	Is that correct, Ms. Bailey?
22	MS. BAILEY:
23	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Very well. And that
24	would be
25	COURT REPORTER: I?m sorry.

I?m

2	going to be repeating what she says.
3	So, Ms. Bailey, that would be Kevin R.
4	West. Application 17365. And that would be for a
5	variance as advertised, I would say, for a variance
6	from the lot occupancy requirements under subsection
7	403. Variance from the rear yard requirements to
8	allow a two-story rear addition to an existing single-
9	family row dwelling at premises 1535 A Street, SE.
10	Now the application has been amended? The
11	Applicant has put in sufficient information into the
12	record that amended the application in order to reduce
13	the required relief to a special exception under
14	Section 223. And the Applicant was asked to provide a
15	new plat showing the project?s revised dimensions.
16	With that, let us go right ahead and have
17	the Applicant introduce themselves for the record with
18	the name and address please.
19	MR. WEST: Kevin R. West, 1530 A Street,
20	SE.
21	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Excellent. And you did
22	submit a revised plat. Is that correct?
23	MR. WEST: Yes.
24	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Good. And I?ll pull
25	that out while you start any opening statements that
	1

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: That?s all right.

1	you might have.
2	MR. WEST: Okay. Basically, my proposal
3	is to add on to the rear of the house to add on a
4	kitchen and a bedroom above it. A two-story rear
5	addition.
6	Originally we were using the numbers for
7	the square footage of the lot that was in the tax
8	record which was 661. And when we originally drew the
9	plans, we thought we were going to be under 70 percent
10	for the special exception.
11	When the Zoning Administrator looked at it
12	and we looked it as well, at the plat from the
13	surveyor?s office, it was obvious it was 653 and not
14	661.
15	I was also unaware that a rear balcony was
16	counted in the lot occupancy. And so to come into
17	compliance with the lot occupancy requirements for a
18	special exception, we?ve removed the rear balcony from
19	the drawings and also reduced the size of the addition
20	by four inches to bring it under 70 percent, four
21	linear inches.
22	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Okay. Excellent.
23	Is it correct, you?re just up above 400
24	square feet in this house with the addition

MR. WEST: For the lot occupancy. Yes.

1	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: That?s the lot
2	occupancy, so that?s not occupiable space. So, your
3	footprint?s about 400, 13 square feet?
4	MR. WEST: The lot occupancy
5	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: I think that?s right.
6	MR. WEST: 456.
7	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: So, it?s 63.29 percent
8	if the Office of Planning?s statistics, data, is
9	correct. That?s what I?m looking at.
10	MR. WEST: Okay.
11	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: But I guess where I?m
12	going is it?s still a pretty small house?
13	MR. WEST: Yes.
14	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Okay. Well, we?re
15	going to have to give you less time then in
16	presentation based on the total square footage of the
17	house.
18	Anything else?
19	MR. WEST: No. I think that?s it.
20	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Okay. Any questions
21	from the Board?
22	MR. MANN: Mr. Chairman?
23	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Yes.
24	MR. MANN:how about this?
25	I just had a question regarding whether or

not the house is or is not in the Capitol Hill
Historic District?
MR. WEST: It is not.
MR. MANN: Okay. So, Capitol Hill
Restoration Society weighs in just because it?s within
their area of influence then?
MR. WEST: Yes. Just because it?sI
mean, it?s on Capitol Hill, but it?s about three
blocks outside.
MR. MANN: Okay. Thank you.
CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Okay. Any other
questions?
You indicated that you took the rear
balcony off. That was obviously to stay within the
lot occupancy that would keep it a special exception.
MR. WEST: Yes.
CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Do we have
documentation that show that or
MR. WEST: Yes. Let?s see. That original
plan that you have there shows it and then I
resubmitted those same plans to show
CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Okay. I think I have
it here.
MR. WEST: Okay.

	pick her up.
2	Well, in any case, I thought I did
3	actually get this with the entire package. But
4	nonetheless, there?s probably additional material that
5	was submitted to us today, but it obviously shows it
6	here in that removal of the balcony. Okay.
7	I don?t have any other additional
8	questions or concerns, unless others have questions to
9	be brought up.
10	Let?s move right ahead then to the Office
11	of Planning?s report. Mr. Cochran, how are you this
12	afternoon?
13	MR. COCHRAN: Fine. Thank you, Mr.
14	Chairman, on this lovely day.
15	For the record, my name is Steven Cochran,
16	Office of Planning and I wish you would meet up in
17	this room more often.
18	The Office of Planning is satisfied that
19	the Applicant has revised the application sufficient
20	to meet its ability to be considered under Section
21	223, that it meets the test for 223 and stands on its
22	report.
23	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Excellent. Thank you
24	very much.
25	Is there questions from the Board of the

Office of Planning? 1 2 Ms. Miller: 3 VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Yes. I have one question. 4 I was wondering if you might elaborate 5 what you had in mind when you made this statement on 6 7 page 5 which says, OP believes the proposed structure is the type of addition intended to be addressed by 8 Section 223? What about this made you say that it?s a 9 type of edition that 223 intended to address? 10 Well, that it meets all the 11 MR. WEST: 12 It?s a simple addition to a small house. tests. 13 comes in under 70 percent lot occupancy. It doesn?t 14 have any impact on the neighbors and let?s see what 15 else I can get to strengthen the record. The addition as viewed from the street 16 17 won?t really intrude on the character of the street, because the character of the street is changing anyway 18 because it?s not in the historic district. 19 20 CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Doesn?t it go 21 fundamentally to what the regulations were actually 2.2 written for? I mean, I was expecting your answer to be, Op believes that the proposed structure is the 23 type of edition intended to be addressed in Section 24

that

this

is

an

223

by

indicating

25

existing,

	noncomorming scructure that lits within the limits of
2	the lot occupancy laid out in the regulation. That?s
3	exactly what the special exception was meant to
4	provide for.
5	MR. WEST: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think
6	you?ve said that far more eloquently than I ever could
7	have. But certainly as eloquently as I should have.
8	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Close the record right
9	there. Bring the gavel. Okay.
10	MR. WEST: If I may, I incorporate the
11	Chairman?s restatement of my answer into OP?s
12	testimony.
13	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Well, I don?t
14	now if I?ll let you do that.
15	No. I just wanted just to follow up one
16	more time.
17	I understand it meets the test that?s why
18	I think it?s fine.
19	MR. WEST: Okay.
20	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: But you also
21	made a statement and I want to pursue it one more
22	second.
23	That it was a simple edition to a small
24	house. Is that what you think the 223 primarily is
25	intended to address?

1	MR. WEST: Not necessarily a small house.
2	No. Because I?ve certainly seen additions to fairly
3	large houses in different parts of town. I think it?s
4	intended to addressit?s intended to let a single
5	family house that?s all on the same nonconforming lot
6	go through a simple edition with very little hassle
7	because the point of this is to encourage people to be
8	able to stay in the city. And as I understand where
9	223 came from without having to go through all kinds
10	of proof of hardship.
11	This does not need to meet the hardship
12	test. It simply needs to prove that it doesn?t have
13	any negative impact on anybody else.
14	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Thank you.
15	MR. WEST: Do you think that was better
16	said than yours, Mr. Chair?
17	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: No. But, let?s follow
18	up on in addition and this will be our last egression
19	into this.
20	But the regulation itself, do you believe
21	that it sets up the parameters for scale in that?
22	Does it set up the limits of which you fall under 223
23	for a special exception?
24	MR. WEST: Mr. Chair
25	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: And therefore it

MR. WEST: speaking of getting set up.
I?m not sure what I am getting set up for by this
series of questions.
CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Very well. We?ll let
it go at that. Okay.
VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I certainly
wasn?t setting you up, but often 223 comes up and the
question of what was it?s intent comes up at various
times. And so your statement seemed to address in
which you saw was its intent and so that?s why I was
just following up. Thank you.
CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Okay. If there?s
nothing else for grilling the Office of Planning, the
Board will ask if the Applicant has any cross
examination, any questions of the Office of Planning?
MR. WEST: No.
CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Okay. And you do have
the report?
MR. WEST: I do.
CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Excellent. Then
lastly, Mr. Cochran, an excellent report and analysis
is well done. And I do think it exactly goes to the
test on how this application makes it.
Prior to making that definitive assertion

application. And let me ask if 6B is present. 1 Not noting ANC members are with us today, 2 3 we will take note that Exhibit Number 21 is the ANC recommendation for approval of the application. 4 mentioned 5 have already the historic aspects that have been put into the record. 6 7 Letters of support have been submitted into the record. Exhibit 28 and 29, 25, 24, 23, 22 8 and 19. Let me ask if there?s anybody present here 9 10 today, persons present to provide testimony 11 Application 17365 either in support or in opposition? 12 Making notice that there is no one here 13 present to provide testimony, we turn it over to Mr. 14 West for any closing remarks that you might have. 15 MR. WEST: Nothing. Thank you. CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Excellent. Mr. West, 16 17 thank you very much. We appreciate all the work you?ve done in terms of addressing some of the issues 18 that have come forward based on the variance in the 19 20 beginning and then the special exception accommodation 21 for the Special Exception. I think you?ll find that 2.2 Section 223 is actually one of the well written sections to the regulations as opposed to some others 23 that may not be as well written. 24

But it specifically addresses a growing

need and a continued need in the city and that is we have numerous structures and house, single family or family residences that were made nonconforming once we adopted our own zoning regulations.

And prior to the writing of Section 223, it was a variance which is a very high threshold of neatness and practical difficulty in compliance with the regulations.

allows for the additions 223 and modifications accommodations and for existing structures that are noncompliant and other aspects that are enumerated in 223. You clearly have come in under the lot occupancy which is the threshold of scale that starts to talk about whether it?s a small house or a small education. The level of parameters allowable in Section 223 is very clear. I don?t think there?s any need to go into additional intent as its writing is plain. And you have met it.

Additionally, the test, of course, for special exception specifics under 223 is whether this would if approved improve the light there, use and privacy of the adjoining neighbors, whether there?s any sort of design criteria that the Board feels is required to put upon you in terms of your construction.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

1	I think the two parameters have been met
2	and that no negative impacts would be created in terms
3	of rising to a level of design control, I haven?t seen
4	any evidence that would make us move in that
5	direction. Therefore, would move for approval of
6	Application 17365 and ask for a second.
7	MR. MANN: Second.
8	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Thank you very much,
9	Mr. Mann. I?ll throw this comment on the motion
10	that?s before us and seconded.
11	If there?s nothing further from the board,
12	then we do have a motion, of course, seconded.
13	I ask that all in favor signify by saying
14	aye?
15	(AYES)
16	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Opposed? Abstaining?
17	Very well. Thank you very much.
18	We?ll note that the motion was put forth
19	by the Chairman. It was seconded by Mr. Mann. The
20	approval was unanimous.
21	I don?t see any reason why we wouldn?t
22	waive our rules and regulations to issue a summary
23	order on this unless any Board member has concerns or
24	objection to doing that.
25	Not noting any concerns or objections, Mr.

West, thank you very much. We appreciate it and good
luck with that. It looks like a great addition, quite
frankly, to the rear of the structure and we didn?t
get into all the details of your siting on the
adjacent property and how you actually face a couple
of them and one side faces your rear. But it was all
very well put forward and documented for the Board?s
understanding, which makes it all the more easier to
get through this expeditiously.
That being said, have a great afternoon.
MR. WEST: Thank you. Thank you very
much.
CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: If you wouldn?t just
mind putting the witness cards in at that point.
At this time, we are at the 2:30 mark.
We?ve done a meeting, entire morning and half the
afternoon.
We?re going to take a 15-minute break and
then we?ll resume. I?m anticipating by 2:45 and not
much later.
(Whereupon, off the record from 2:19 p.m.
to 2:52 p.m.)
CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Excuse me. Let?s
resume then the afternoon session.
I understand the witnesses have come in

that need to be sworn in. So, I?m going to ask you to 1 2 stand and you can give your attention to Ms. Bailey. 3 (Witnesses Sworn.) 4 CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Excellent. So, the 5 witnesses have been sworn in. Let?s move ahead then and call the next 6 case for Board consideration this afternoon. 7 Ms. Bailey, I quess I?ll do that for you. 8 Ms. Bailey, I?ll get it for you. 9 We?ll call Application 17367. That is for 10 11 a variance from the use provisions to renovate and 12 convert a vacant building, formerly used as a private 13 school, into а four-unit condominium apartment 14 building under subsection 320.3, and variances to allow an elevator to be installed within an existing 15 nonconforming closed court and to allow a parking pad 16 17 to be constructed at the rear of a nonconforming structure under Section 403 and Subsection 2001.3, at 18 19 the premises 2129 S Street, NW. 20 This is an R-3 District. It?s Square 21 2532, Lot 13. And the Applicant is here and ready to 2.2 proceed. don?t 23 we have everyone introduce 24 themselves and we?ll move right into the case. 25 MR. COLLINS: Thank you. Good afternoon.

My name is Chris Collins of the law firm of Holland and Knight. Seated to my right is Kyrus Freeman from our office. To my immediate left is Vincent Hurteau, the Applicant, and to my far left is a Greg Kearley of Inscape Studios.

This is an application for variances to convert a 9,000 square foot, 55-1/2 foot tall, six-level building formerly used as a school for up to 200 students for the last 60 years into a four-unit condominium in the R-3 Zone.

This application is for a use variance because the apartment use is not permitted in the R-3 Zone. An area variance relief is also needed because the building is a nonconforming structure and we?re adding an addition to a nonconforming structure and we?re increasing the lot occupancy from about 75 percent to bout 95 percent to install a parking pad in the rear of the building adjacent to the alley.

An elevator will also be installed in the building within an existing closed port and the closed port is already included in the lot occupancy. So, the elevator does not add to the lot occupancy, but is an addition to a nonconforming structure.

The most recent certificate of occupancy issued for this building in 2002 indicates that it is

2.2

for a school for 200 students. It does not indicate the number of faculty and staff. So, it?s safe to assume that the maximum occupancy was over 200 people in that building.

The building was used as a school for 60 years since 1945 for a number of different uses and could be used for a school today if, in fact, there?s some school in the market, which there is not right now.

It was on the market for over 3-1/2 months and during that time as the witnesses will testify, there were only two interested buyers for the property. A number of people did come and look at it. Only two expressed interest in it and both were for multiple dwelling use.

There was no interest expressed by any buyer, potential buyer, for any matter of right use or special exception use for this property. It is a unique building. It is by far the largest building on this side of S Street in this block. It is six levels, 9,000 plus square feet in the R-3 Zone.

It has a school configuration on the inside from a school used for over half a century and it?s a sloping site.

As the evidence will show, it is too large

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

2.2

for a single family dwelling. It is too large for a flat. It is two large for three units. It just doesn?t configure well. We have testimony both from the owner who I offer as an expert witness in real estate brokerage and residential sales and also from the architect who we will offer as an expert in architecture.

A flat, I just note parenthetically, the flat, a two-unit building and a three-unit building would also require a use variance in the zone.

The building does measure about 4.24 FAR, although as you know, FAR is not calculated in the R-3 zone. That?s how big the building is.

The number of units as the witnesses will testify, the number of units to be put in the building is a function of a number of thing. The building size, the layout of the units, the renovation costs and the market.

The building is not suited for matter of right uses. The demolition of the building or portions of the building is not an option. It is in an historic district. It?s a contributing building. It?s a very important building and it will be restored in accordance with the requirements of the Historic Preservation Review board.

2.2

The strict application of the use regulations here would impose an undue hardship on the owner.

The certification of the area regulations would impose a practical difficulty, because it is desirable to add parking. The only way to add parking on this site and there?s only space for one car, maybe two, if you squeeze, is to put a parking pad in the rear off the alley to make a flat surface. The property does slope from the alley pretty severely down to the building. So, you would be parking on an angle of about 30 degrees or so. The plans will show the actual angle, which is impractical.

The only other theoretical options would be to park in the front yard which is also not an option because it?s public space and historic preservation would never allow it. Or to put a garage door in the front of the building and park inside, which the Historic Preservation Review Board also would not allow.

Finally, relief can be granted without substantial detriment to the public without substantially impairing the intent, purpose or the integrity of the zone plan.

This will be a residential use in a

2.2

residential zone in a residential neighborhood. Ιt 1 2 will be much, much less dense and much less traffic 3 will come to the site with this four-unit condo than there was with the 200-student school. 4 The use that?s proposed is consistent with 5 the Board approved apartment house uses for the 6 7 majority of the properties on the north side of S Street in the R-3 Zone between Connecticut and Phelps. 8 The building additions that are being proposed will 9 not be visible from public space and do not add 10 11 occupiable gross floor are to the building. 12 We?ve submitted а statement the 13 Applicant, which has a certain number of exhibits with 14 I?ll just quickly go through them. Exhibit A shows the site on S Street. 15 It?s Lot 13. It?s near the intersection of Phelps and 16 17 S. B is the plat which shows the lot. It is 25 feet wide and very long, 85 feet in depth. 18 Exhibit C is a zoning map. You can see 19 20 that it is in the R-3 Zone. The DR-3 zone is directly 21 to the south. R-5B is a block away and the commercial area along Connecticut Avenue is half a block to the 2.2 23 east. Exhibit D is the original approval from 24 25 1945 for school use of the property.

Exhibit E is the most recent certificate of occupancy from 2002. And you?ll see that under Description of Use it says proprietary school, student enrollment 200.

Exhibit F is the BZA order for the property to the east of the site. That property was part of the Holton Arms School. And as a matter of fact, this property was also a part of the Holton Arms School, which is now relocated to Maryland a number of years ago.

But 2125 S was a project that involved the creation of eight units in a building immediately to the east. There was a vacant parcel between this site and that building, which was developed with a single family dwelling. That?s part of the outside of that project, but it?s part of that whole development. Outside of that BZA part of the whole development. And then a portion of the building, the eastern most part of that building, 2125 S, which was an addition to that building many, many years ago with a firewall in between. That firewall was reintroduced A new front door was put in the eastern resealed up. part of that building. That became a single family dwelling. The central part became an eight-unit apartment house. 2125 S and that is what Exhibit F

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

is.

2.2

Exhibit G is a chronology of the other BZA approvals along the north side of S between Connecticut and Phelps in the R-3 Zone that were conversions from a variety of different uses into multi-family dwellings.

As a matter of fact, the majority of the frontage along the north side of S in the R-3 Zone between Connecticut and Phelps is multi-family dwelling. There?s 115 linear feet of residential, single-family residential and 160 feet of multi-family condominium use, not counting this site.

Exhibit H is the set of plans which Mr. Kearley will address and then Exhibit I and K are the outlines of testimony of the witnesses.

Of course, we have ANC-2D. I met with the Applicant. He made a presentation and they unanimously and enthusiastically supported the application which he will describe for you.

I have two witnesses today unless there are any questions at this point.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Any questions right away? Clarifications?

Good.

MR. COLLINS: The first is Mr. Vincent

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

2	realtor and I would ask that he list his
3	qualifications and then after that I would ask that
4	you accept him as an expert witness.
5	So, would you please identify yourself for
6	the record?
7	MR. HURTEAU: I?m Vincent Hurteau. I have
8	to speak close to this.
9	I?m Vincent Hurteau. I own Continental
10	Properties. We have about 20 agents.
11	I?ve been in the real estate business
12	since 1986, almost 20 years. I sell personally only
13	D.C. I?m a real estate broker and I sell a lot in
14	this neighborhood.
15	I can go intoshall I go into
16	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: How long have you been
17	in the business?
18	MR. HURTEAU: Since 1986.
19	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: How many properties do
20	you list a year on an average?
21	MR. HURTEAU: I sell an average of about
22	55 to 60.
23	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: And are they usually
24	historic in nature and single-family type properties
25	or are they large commercial buildings?

Mr. Hurteau is the owner. He is also a

Hurteau.

1	MR. HURTEAU: Residential condos, co-ops
2	and single-family house, primarily in historic
3	neighborhoods.
4	I sort of joke about it. I live a block
5	from this property, so it?s mostly what I can walk to.
6	So, I do a lot of business in this neighborhood. But
7	I do drive to some of my appointments.
8	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Indeed. Any other
9	questions? Follow-up? From the board.
10	Clarifications on being proffered as an expert
11	witness, Ms. Miller?
12	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Do you have any
13	experience marketing for schools?
14	MR. HURTEAU: I don?t. In fact, when I
15	bought this property and I went to the ANC, I put
16	notice to all the neighbors about the ANC meeting
17	telling them that I?m proposing to make changes to
18	this building and that I could either keep it a school
19	or I couldI?d like to create it into condos. But if
20	I keep it as a school, my plan was to hire a
21	commercial broker because I do not deal with
22	commercial real estate, so hire a commercial broker to
23	lease the property.
24	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Thank you.
25	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Anything else? Any

1	other questions?
2	Is there any objection to Mr. Hurteau
3	being offered as an expert witness in real estate
4	sales and brokerage?
5	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: It?s in the
6	residential area. Correct?
7	MR. HURTEAU: Residential.
8	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Any difficulty?
9	I don?t see any reason why we would
10	preclude him from testifying as a expert witness. Why
11	don?t we move ahead.
12	Do you want to take both witnesses at this
13	time, Mr. Collins, so we can move right into the
14	witness.
15	MR. COLLINS: For expert? Sure.
16	The next person I would like to offer as a
17	witness is Mr. Greg Kearley who is the principal and
18	head of his own architecture firm. And I?ve submitted
19	to the Chair copies of the curriculum vitae of the
20	witness.
21	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Questions?
22	MR. COLLINS: Mr. Kearley, would you like
23	to summarize your experience?
24	MR. KEARLEY: My name is Greg Kearley.
25	I?m the principal and founder of Inscape Studio. We?re

_	an architecture firm in b.c. we do about hair our
2	work with residential design. About half of that is
3	single-family homes. The other half multi-family
4	homes.
5	We?re been around for about eight years
6	and I don?t know if I need to go any further than
7	that?
8	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: No. I don?t so. You
9	were established in 1998 and you do new buildings and
10	also renovation adaptations?
11	MR. KEARLEY: Both base building and
12	renovation additions.
13	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Okay. And mostly in
14	the District of Columbia?
15	MR. KEARLEY: I?d say 75 percent of our
16	work is regional, district or Maryland. Probably
17	more. I?d say half of our work is in the District
18	itself.
19	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Excellent. Okay.
20	As the Board is ware, we have seen Mr.
21	Kearley?s firm presented before in projects before
22	this Board.
23	Questions? Any other questions?
24	Clarifications? Any objections to establish Mr.
25	Kearley as an expert witness in architecture and

1	design?
2	Very well. Let?s proceed, Mr. Collins. I
3	think we can take them both in as expert witnesses.
4	MR. COLLINS: Thank you.
5	Mr. Hurteau, would you please state your
6	home address and then proceed with your testimony.
7	MR. HURTEAU: Okay. I live at 1705 21st
8	Street, NW, which is literally around the corner from
9	the subject property.
10	I?ve lived there since 1997. I brought
11	this property in hopes to making it a condo, seeing
12	that there are other condos on the block and
13	converting it to a condominium and living in a larger
14	unit of that property.
15	Shall I go on?
16	MR. COLLINS: Yes, please.
17	MR. HURTEAU: Okay. Great.
18	When I went to the ANC meeting as I
19	discussed earlier, many of the neighbors knowing that
20	there were several schools there before. There was a
21	Kingsbury School that used to be there around to one
22	side. The Holton Arms that this is a part of. So,
23	there are many schools. A lot of faculty. People with
24	cars, buses and other things.

And so the neighborhood when I proposed

making a condominium, I faced almost no objection to it. In fact, the things that were brought up were primarily, especially the people from Bancroft, that my construction vehicles wouldn?t block the alley so the trash could be picked up in the alley. That seemed to be their big concern. Apparently, there is other construction going on where they blocked the alley and then the trash trucks don?t come down because of that.

But they were looking at--I mentioned I seen a school with 200 adults as it was just before I bought it and faculty and then make it into a four-unit condo. The congestion is far less and so I was overwhelmingly supported.

When I went the second time to the ANC, they had the vote and I was overwhelmingly supported to make it into residential condos.

The building itself is six levels. I sell real estate and I?ve sold tall houses and a tall house is usually three levels plus a basement. Every now and then there?s a four-level house plus a basement. I?ve never seen in my real estate experience a six-level house. It is a freakish height of the house. It is to put it blunt. I don?t know if any of you have ever experience or visited a house that has six

2.2

levels. And this is a six-level house and that?s one 1 the reasons why I wanted to make it into a 2 3 condominium. brought several exhibits 4 Now, Ι they?re mostly in response to the Office of Planning. 5 And I realize they?re late, but they?re mainly in 6 7 response or in rebuttal to the Office of Planning So, I brought them in a box back here which 8 report. I?11 pass around afterwards. 9 10 But I?ll go over a few point, brief points 11 about that. 12 Now, when I bought the house, it had been on the market for several months. At the same time 13 14 there were a couple of other properties that sold 15 There were properties that were residential They weren?t as tall and they had sold 16 in use. 17 quickly. 18 This one has a--CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: What?s quickly? 19 20 MR. HURTEAU: The one on, let me just find 21 it here. One sold in zero days, 2344 California 2.2 That sold the And 2336 Street. same day. 23 Massachusetts Avenue sold in 15 days. Both are 24 single-family houses, not quite as large as this 25 house, but both single-family houses.

1 The house was on the market 112 days at 2 2129 S. Street. 3 CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: What was the price 4 range of the others? 5 MR. HURTEAU: The price range of the others--6 7 CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Is it comparable to what this one was? 8 MR. HURTEAU: Comparable. Yes. 9 And one I mean the 10 is more and the other two are higher. 11 other one is higher. The one on Massachusetts is 12 slightly less. And the one on California Street is 13 higher. But all in the same neighborhood, R-3 zoning, 14 etcetera. And built as a single-family house. 15 This place has been used as a school for 16 two-thirds of its life. It has dropped ceilings. 17 basically looks like an office building or a school. 18 CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: What are drop ceilings? Drop ceilings are basically 19 MR. HURTEAU: 20 this. Instead of seeing the ceiling like this, you 21 would see tiles throughout. So, that way you could 2.2 run electrical conduits, plumbing and other things and not have to worry about changing things around. 23 so drop ceilings are used in office-type environments 24 25 or schools.

	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: SO, IS CHAC AN OFIGURAL
2	feature of the single-family home?
3	MR. HURTEAU: It is not. It was added
4	when it became a school.
5	Basically, the house has nine or ten
6	restrooms but no bathrooms per se. It still says men
7	and women or boys and girls on the restrooms.
8	So, the use of it is as a residential.
9	It?s going to take major construction.
10	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: What?s left of the
11	original detail or structure or anything in the house?
12	You walk through it, what does it look like?
13	MR. HURTEAU: The original staircase which
14	I plan to keep and in the second floor front room,
15	which I also plan to restore has some of the original
16	plaster molding in it that I plan to restore. Most of
17	the other detail is long gone.
18	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: And there?s six levels
19	in this house. What was the formal floor on this? Is
20	there a formal floor?
21	MR. HURTEAU: Yes.
22	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: How was it used as a
23	single-family?
24	MR. HURTEAU: I can only surmise and just
25	going through there and trying to guess how it was

2	detective work.
3	There?s a full basement and above the
4	basement is the entry-level, the main floor where you
5	walk in at a reception area with a kitchen in the very
6	back.
7	You go up to the second floor for the
8	living room in the front and the dining room which was
9	almost as long as this room, was on the second floor.
10	The kitchen was not on the same level as the dining
11	room. It had a small pantry and probably a dumb
12	waiter and there?s remnants of a former back stairs in
13	there, just one small piece of it that?s all that?s
14	left of that.
15	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: So, all the service is
16	on the first floor?
17	MR. HURTEAU: First floor and basement.
18	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Kitchen.
19	MR. HURTEAU: Yes.
20	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: That?s where the staff
21	would be in this big house I would imagine.
22	MR. HURTEAU: Yes. First floor and
23	basement.
24	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: I see. So, in the
25	elevation that we?re looking at in the record behind

used and the layout. I was able to do a little

1	you, show me where the second floor is where the
2	living room you said is.
3	MR. HURTEAU: That?s the living room.
4	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: That?s the living room.
5	MR. HURTEAU: This is the entry room.
6	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: I see.
7	MR. HURTEAU: Entry floor.
8	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: So, you have a whole
9	floor that?s just kind of entry?
10	MR. HURTEAU: Yes.
11	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: I see.
12	MR. HURTEAU: And then above this are
13	bedroom. Three levels of bedroom levels.
14	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Okay.
15	MR. HURTEAU: Bedroom floors.
16	One of the things about my making this
17	into a condo is I want to live in the upper part and I
18	also wanted it to make sense to get to the condo
19	units.
20	In other words, instead of having one per
21	floor, we have to consider access to it. So, I wanted
22	to use the access from the first floor and try to make
23	them so they are quickly accessible from the first
24	floor. So, the units revolve around the basement
25	first floor and then part of the third floor.

Basically, I put them at the size that they are because they are not going to have parking. There?s going to be one parking space which I plan to take for myself. They are not going to have parking and large units without parking basically sell for far less per square foot which I also have an exhibit on that.

There was recently a sale at the building

There was recently a sale at the building called the Wyoming. 2022 Columbia Road. It was a fourth floor unit and that one had sold for--let me find my piece of that. Yes. Here it is.

The fourth floor unit at the Wyoming sold for \$1,025,000. About \$380 per square foot. It did not have parking.

In a similar building, 2101 Connecticut, a first floor apartment, that did have parking but it was first floor. It wasn?t very bright. The Wyoming one was far brighter. It was slightly larger and it came with parking. That sold for \$625 per square foot. So, it?s a big difference.

If I were to make these into large units without parking, people who buy large units want parking. And if it doesn?t have parking, usually there has to be a big discount involved.

Smaller units, however, people are mostly

2.2

1 used to in the real estate market not getting parking. 2 They?d like parking, but they predominately do not 3 come with parking. In that case, I also have with the exhibit 4 5 2115 S Street, which is similar in nature to the type of units that are creating similar size. 1,075 square 6 7 feet and that one recently sold for \$582,000 basically \$541 a square foot. 8 The bottom line of what I?m saying is--9 10 CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: did it have parking or 11 not? 12 MR. HURTEAU: No parking. No rental 13 parking. 14 CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: I see. Yes. The bottom line of 15 MR. HURTEAU: 16 what I?m stating is, if you have a humongous unit 17 without parking, it?s to its detriment in units sale 18 because people who buy large units expect that. they have enough places with large apartments around 19 20 to buy with parking, so that they must sell for a lot 21 less per square foot. 2.2 These two are right by each other and 23 close to the subject property. The one without 24 parking, a condo on the fourth floor, sold for \$380 a 25 square foot and the co-op on the first floor sold for

1 \$625 a square foot and it included parking. 2 So, that?s an economic hardship just on 3 the difference of that and I have the copies of the multiple listing sheet with that in the exhibit. 4 5 Again, this comes in late, but it?s in response to the other part. 6 Another thing too about the property is as 7 you know, it has been a -- let me just go to this. 8 looked at two neighborhoods. 9 Right is Bancroft. Bancroft has 30 houses. 10 behind it 11 Basically 30 single-family house. Thirty deeds, 12 thirty houses. Actually, one of the deeds is for a 13 garage that goes with the house. But it goes with the 14 house and that?s it. Now, I pulled up the deeds, all the deeds 15 16 for everything in the 2100 block of S Street, similar 17 to pulling up everything on the 2100 block of Bancroft. I came up with 45 deeds. 18 Now, of those 45 deeds, what I found was 19 20 there are only eight single-family houses. One also 21 is a single-family house with a dentist office. Three 2.2 are embassies, one has been a school, my property, and 32 condominiums. 23 24 So, basically, this neighborhood, this 25 immediate block, has always been similar and some

people consider it almost part of Dupont, because it?s similar in nature. It is predominately condominiums with a few embassies mixed in. It?s a mixed-use block.

It is unlike Bancroft. And in the appearance it may look a little like it physically but it has always been different. And that?s why I wanted emphasize, it?s not changing --causing harm to the public good. It?s hardly going to be a change and I think it will be for the better not to have large amount of students but instead four residential units.

But on that also I want to emphasize the 2100 block of S, not only being a micro neighborhood, Dr. Singer who lives at 2110 S Street is a former head of the DCCA, Dupont Circle citizens Association, while he lived at 2110 S Street which he still lives today.

So, he was the president of the DCCA while living there on that block. That was considered and a lot of people still consider part of Dupont Circle. That block is completely different from Bancroft and the other blocks in Kalorama, which is zoned R-3.

And if you notice, we?re right next to the different types of zoning, commercial and the residential zoning, R-5, I believe it is on 21st Street. So, it?s almost been like seamless between

2.2

	those two neighborhoods. They are similar in nature.
2	And S Street has always been different from Bancroft.
3	And making this change to a freakishly
4	tall six-level house, I cannot see possibly it being
5	to the detriment and the neighborhood overwhelmingly
6	supported me keeping it residential and making it four
7	units.
8	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Well, outside of the
9	detriment which is, of course, the third when you get
LO	through the first two.
11	MR. HURTEAU: Sure.
L2	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: What I understand your
L3	testimony to be is that part of its uniqueness
L4	MR. HURTEAU: Yes.
L5	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: is the zoning
L6	history of this. I mean, this was built in 1910, I
L7	believe, it was or 1908 or 9?
L8	MR. HURTEAU: Right around
L9	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Turn of the century.
20	MR. HURTEAU: Yes.
21	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Which is pretty clearly
22	before 1958, R zoning was adopted.
23	MR. HURTEAU: Yes. That?s right.
24	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: So, what you?re saying
25	that this in the R-3 in its mapping, this doesn?t even

really begin to fit that parameter. And I understand 1 2 that pulling of the deeds, you?re saying that the 3 fabric of the block itself doesn?t fit that parameter which adds to the uniqueness to the situation that 4 5 this building is set in. Is that correct? MR. HURTEAU: Precisely. If we were to go 6 7 strictly by R-3 zoning, which the majority of the block does not go by. 8 CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Right. 9 In order words, we have 45 10 MR. HURTEAU: 11 deeds and we have 8 houses that are still single 12 family that are 8 deeds for single-family houses only. 13 And then a ninth one is mixed-use single-family plus a dentist office in the basement. 14 Out of the 45 15 deeds. CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: 16 Okay. And you said that the six levels and the size of this lends itself 17 to the specific uniqueness of this property. 18 I think it?s probably going to be very 19 20 advantageous if you also talk directly to what is the most difficult threshold with a use variance. 21 And that as you stated in your submission, Palmer lays out 2.2 What other evidence is there that there is 23 very well. any conforming use that could bring a fair or 24

reasonable return on your investment?

1 You?ve indicated the comparison of condos. 2 You?ve indicated that if you were going to go for a 3 school, you would have hired a commercial realtor. 4 MR. HURTEAU: Yes. 5 CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Is there any steps just investigating if there was that outside of how long it 6 7 sat on the market or shall we hear more about how long it sat on the market in comparison to comparables that 8 took a few days to leave? 9 MR. HURTEAU: Well, it sat on the market a 10 11 long time because there were no schools that were 12 There?s no schools that willing to pay that. 13 expressed interest enough to write a contract. One other contract expressed interest and 14 15 they wanted to have it contingent upon a--actually a 16 BZA meeting and I was told by the listing agent. 17 the owner said we don?t want to wait for that. We don?t want to wait that amount of time. 18 19 Basically, I took the chance. 20 the property with the chance that going to BZA meeting 21 thinking--basically assuming that based on the way the 2.2 block is, that this would not greatly change it, that it?s likely to be approved. 23 24 owner would not take The а contract

contingent upon a BZA meeting.

Now, I did not meet the other prospective 1 2 buyer, but I can only imagine being a developer as 3 opposed to me who I want to live in the property, so I want to live in the larger unit in it. 4 I can only 5 imagine to maximize the profit on this building, would be to make far more units out of a 9,000 plus square 6 7 foot building, which what I want to do is merely for. MR. COLLINS: Could you talk a little bit 8 about or you did, but kind of bring it back full 9 circle about the fact that, did you think about in 10 11 developing this, a two-unit building? Did you talk 12 about a two-unit? 13 MR. HURTEAU: Yes. 14 MR. COLLINS: Would you talk about that a little bit? 15 16 MR. HURTEAU: I did think about two units. 17 The problem is because of the one parking space. Ιt 18 could be made into a two-unit condo but the problem is 19 is just with the one parking space. The unit has to 20 be small enough where not having parking is not to its 21 detriment for its sale. And many of the units on the 2.2 block in the 2115-2117-2107 S Street do not have 23 parking with them. And they are smaller. Around the 24 size that I?m proposing between 1,000 and 1,200 square

feet roughly, two-bedroom apartments. And so basically

1	my idea was to mimic those, those sizes, and put those
2	in here and then live in the rest of the building.
3	MR. COLLINS: What about three units?
4	MR. HURTEAU: Again, three units would be
5	then two still fairly large units. Once you get above
6	about 1,200 square feet, to have three units would
7	have to be larger and once you get above that, the
8	price drops considerably because once you get to a
9	point of a property without parking, even if it?s big,
10	it makes it a difficult sale. It really has to stay
11	closer to 1,000 to 1,200 or smaller.
12	MR. COLLINS: During the time that you
13	the 3-1/2 months. Was 3-1/2 months an unusually long
14	period of time for the property to be on the market?
14 15	period of time for the property to be on the market? MR. HURTEAU: At that time. Yes. Yes.
15	MR. HURTEAU: At that time. Yes. Yes.
15 16	MR. HURTEAU: At that time. Yes. Yes. At that time it was. It was a spring market, which is
15 16 17	MR. HURTEAU: At that time. Yes. Yes. At that time it was. It was a spring market, which is generally strong at that time of the year it was.
15 16 17 18	MR. HURTEAU: At that time. Yes. Yes. At that time it was. It was a spring market, which is generally strong at that time of the year it was. MR. COLLINS: and you?ve given two
15 16 17 18	MR. HURTEAU: At that time. Yes. Yes. At that time it was. It was a spring market, which is generally strong at that time of the year it was. MR. COLLINS: and you?ve given two examples of buildings, one that sold the same day and
15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. HURTEAU: At that time. Yes. Yes. At that time it was. It was a spring market, which is generally strong at that time of the year it was. MR. COLLINS: and you?ve given two examples of buildings, one that sold the same day and one a short period of time thereafter.
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. HURTEAU: At that time. Yes. Yes. At that time it was. It was a spring market, which is generally strong at that time of the year it was. MR. COLLINS: and you?ve given two examples of buildings, one that sold the same day and one a short period of time thereafter. MR. HURTEAU: Yes.
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. HURTEAU: At that time. Yes. Yes. At that time it was. It was a spring market, which is generally strong at that time of the year it was. MR. COLLINS: and you?ve given two examples of buildings, one that sold the same day and one a short period of time thereafter. MR. HURTEAU: Yes. MR. COLLINS: Was that generally the
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. HURTEAU: At that time. Yes. Yes. At that time it was. It was a spring market, which is generally strong at that time of the year it was. MR. COLLINS: and you?ve given two examples of buildings, one that sold the same day and one a short period of time thereafter. MR. HURTEAU: Yes. MR. COLLINS: Was that generally the pattern of sale?

1	MR. COLLINS: Of real estate generally?
2	MR. HURTEAU: Yes. In especially that
3	neighborhood. And both were single-family houses.
4	MR. COLLINS: Okay. And the other uses
5	that are allowed are a House of Worship, a charter
6	school, public school, home for handicapped
7	individuals?
8	MR. HURTEAU: I mean it was listed as both
9	commercial and residential, this property. So, it was
10	because of the school use, agents had access to it.
11	They were aware of it. It was listed with Randall
12	Hagner Company, which has a separate commercial
13	brokerage. So, it was fully out there in the
14	commercial market for people to know if was for sale.
15	It was also listed in the residential
16	section and it was just myself and the other real
17	estate developer that had an interest in the property.
18	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Did you say it
19	didn?t sell to a school because the school wouldn?t
20	pay the price?
21	MR. HURTEAU: Actually, I don?t know,
22	because I don?t sell commercial real estate. But what
23	I do know is that there was no interest expressed by a
24	school or by anybody for a commercial use for the
25	property.

MR. KEARLEY: Could I make a comment to that?

We?ve done a number of schools, day care centers, community centers and what not. It?s very difficult to do something like that on six floors, because of the circulation. So, I would say the physical nature of the building itself, if not prohibitive for, I mean, obviously, there was a school in there at the time. But to get it code compliant, especially if you?re talking about children or non-adult school. It?s very difficult situation with six stories. And not ideal is you?re talking about even an adult school.

So, it is a little bit strange that you don?t typically see that type of space used for schools. Now it?s zoned for that and there was one there and it has a history of that, but I think in terms of spending two million for that and then the amount that it would cost to make improvements to that would be somewhat prohibitive for a school to purchase that and do those types of things.

VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Do you know why the school left that was in there?

MR. HURTEAU: Actually, it was a, as I understand it, a Japanese internship program and they

2.2

1	basically became defunct. They are no longer in the
2	business. After settlement, the school was closed.
3	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. And to
4	your knowledge, the property was marketed both
5	commercially and residential?
6	MR. HURTEAU: Yes. Yes. By the Randall
7	Hagner Company.
8	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay.
9	MR. HURTEAU: In fact, sometimes people
10	list their property with an agent who does solely
11	residential real estate. This was done where it?s a
12	company that does it in-house both residential and
13	commercial, which is unusual.
14	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Anything else?
15	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Thank you.
16	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Yes. Mr. Hood.
17	MR. HOOD: Let?s look at the elevator. Is
18	the elevator going to be
19	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Pull that mike around.
20	MR. HOOD: I?m sorry. Can you hear me?
21	Okay.
22	Is the proposed elevator going to be on
23	the inner workinginner part of the building or is it
24	going to be an extension from the outside?
25	MR. HURTEAU: There?s going to be a very
	l I

1	small extension. It goes five floors down. It?s a
2	light well air shaft that goes five floor down. But
3	because of the building on this level, the court only
4	goes up to this ledge here. I?m sorry.
5	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Yes. Hold that. That
6	comes out of the base if you want to pull it.
7	MR. HURTEAU: Oh, sorry. There we are.
8	Okay. Can you hear me now? Okay.
9	It goes all the way through the building,
10	the shaft, but it goes up to this wall here and so
11	what I?m basically proposing to do is have a hydraulic
12	elevator. That way no machinery is needed above so it
13	can go up to about this level and not higher. So,
14	basically, it?s going to be added from here to here,
15	if you could see that.
16	So, it?s just basically this amount of
17	space.
18	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: You?re talking about
19	the overrun.
20	MR. HURTEAU: For the elevator.
21	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: You?re talking about
22	the placement of it?
23	MR. HOOD: Yes. I was talking about the
24	placement. That leads me to my next question.
25	Hydraulics won?t require a machine room?

	MR. HURIEAU: Actually, since the elevator
2	will go from the first floor up and not to the
3	basement, the mechanics part will be underneath.
4	MR. HOOD: So, hydraulic, that?s the one
5	with the piston where you have to drill down?
6	MR. HURTEAU: Actually, I?m not sure.
7	MR. COLLINS: You would typically go down
8	a floor from below where you?re entering the first
9	floor of the elevator and since we?re entering at the
10	first floor and not the basement, the housing for the
11	elevator will be on the basement level. So, we won?t
12	have to dig down farther.
13	MR. HOOD: So, you won?t have to dig
14	that?s my point. The machine room is going to be in
15	the basement so
16	MR. HURTEAU: Exactly.
17	MR. HOOD:the piston will not have to
18	go into the ground.
19	MR. HURTEAU: That is correct.
20	MR. HOOD: Okay.
21	MR. KEARLEY: That is correct.
22	Now, we?re working with a structural
23	engineering to design this so there?s no problems with
24	any neighboring properties and we?re not dealing with
25	integrity of either the adjacent property or our

1	property, because we are going to have to do some work
2	in that shaft to get this ready for an elevator. So,
3	they?ll be some work there, but it will all be within
4	the boundaries of our property and it will all be
5	within that closed court, which is an existing closed
6	court which is a nonconforming court. So, we?re
7	actually getting rid of a nonconforming part of the
8	building.
9	MR. HOOD: Okay.
10	MR. HURTEAU: Also, I?d like to add to it
11	briefly.
12	Because it?s set backokay. Because it?s
13	set back so far in the ledge, it?s not visible from
14	the street as well. So, since we?re coming up where
15	number one is, coming up just slightly, it?s not
16	visible from the street. So, it?s going to be pretty
17	well hidden.
18	MR. HOOD: Okay. All right. Thank you.
19	MR. HURTEAU: Certainly.
20	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: While we?re on the
21	elevator, can you just explain a little bit how and
22	where it accesses?
23	MR. COLLINS: That goes into the
24	architecture.
25	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Okay. We?re going too

1	far ahead.
2	MEMBER ETHERLY: So, if you?re finished
3	with Mr. Hurteau. Are there any questions of Mr.
4	Hurteau?
5	Unless if there are any questions of Mr.
6	Hurteau, we could finish those up and then go to Mr.
7	Kearley.
8	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Questions?
9	MEMBER ETHERLY: Let me follow on the
10	conversation that you had with Ms. Miller regarding
11	the issue of the units. I just want to make sure I
12	understand the argument that?s being offered.
13	So, in this particular area, maybe not
14	generally speaking, but just in this particular area,
15	it?s your experience that if you were to go to larger-
16	sized units, which perhaps I in my layman?s experience
17	might think, well, that?s more of a benefit for me as
18	I?m looking at potential properties for residential
19	use.
20	It?s your sense that the larger you go the
21	more requirement, off-street parking will be for that
22	potential purchaser?
23	MR. HURTEAU: Yes.
24	MEMBER ETHERLY: Okay. So, if you were to
25	downgrade to two or three units, it is your experience

that you would be very hard-pressed to find a market 1 2 for that type of unit without a vehicle space? 3 MR. HURTEAU: Well, there?s a market for every unit, but the price would drop dramatically. 4 5 MEMBER ETHERLY: Okav. MR. **HURTEAU:** And thus a financial 6 And that?s why I pointed out those two 7 hardship. properties because the one selling without parking. 8 A lot of other buildings out there that 9 were built or converted that have larger units have 10 11 generally more parking available for them with the 12 exception of a handful that do not. But a lot of building with like 2101 Connecticut, for example, had 13 14 land behind it. They made a two-level garage. 2029 Connecticut did the same thing. They made a two-level 15 parking area for it. So, people are often times used 16 17 to getting parking. So, when there?s not parking available for 18 it, the price must go down to reflect that. Because 19 20 people want that in larger properties, especially a 21 million plus. 2.2 MEMBER ETHERLY: And you may, perhaps, have touched upon this in your earlier testimony, but 23 as was noted in the Office of Planning report, there 24 is some precedent for large-scale single-family homes 25

T	In the immediate area. Could you perhaps just speak
2	to again why you feel a single-family home in this
3	particular instance just is entirely not feasible?
4	MR. HURTEAU: Well, one property, 2113 S
5	Street which is on the market right now, is five
6	levels. Five levels are very unusual, but that has
7	been for sale now for probably at least six months.
8	They just dropped the price now to under two million.
9	I do not have the exhibit for that. That is in the
10	MRIC or homesdatabase.com. But that one has been for
11	sale for along time.
12	It?s harder to sell generally taller
13	houses. If they have an elevator, that usually helps,
14	but usually just because functioning as a single unit
15	with so many floors. Five levels are generally harder
16	to sell.
17	But I?ve never ever seen a six level
18	single family house. Nobody I know knows of that and
19	I don?t know if any of you have ever experienced a
20	six-level family house.
21	MEMBER ETHERLY: I believe Mr. Hood has an
22	experience with a six-level personal residence, but
23	that?s beside the point. Okay.
24	Okay. Thank you.
25	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Any other questions at

	this time?
2	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I just have one
3	on the parking.
4	Just a follow up. And I don?t now if this
5	is for Mr. Collins or Mr. Hurteau.
6	But it?s a practical difficulty here just
7	waiting for a request for a variance for the parking,
8	the dramatic difference in price that you?re just
9	referencing for providing parking with a unit.
10	MR. HURTEAU: Well, it?sI?ll let you
11	comment on that.
12	MR. COLLINS: If I could, just clarify
13	that, the issue of the practical difficulty of the
14	parking is different than the use variance standard
15	under hardship. The practical difficulty with parking
16	is that we can provide parking if we can provide it on
17	a parking pad that sits at a 30 to 40 degree slope,
18	which in real life you can?t. You can?t drive off
19	that alley and down at an angle and expect the car to
20	stop before it hits the building.
21	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: But you?re not
22	required to provide parking?
23	MR. COLLINS: We?re not required to
24	provide it. No.

VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: But he wants to

1 provide parking because --COLLINS: If you want to provide 2 MR. 3 parking, there?s no place to put it. It?s a practical You cannot provide any parking anywhere 4 difficulty. on the site without out putting a parking pad. 5 6 CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: I quess your question then, what?s the relief you?re actually 7 would be seeking? 8 MR. COLLINS: It?s lot occupancy. 9 Right. 10 CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: It?s going to lot occupancy because that?s above the main level of 11 12 the residential. So, that pad coming across is 13 increasing the lot occupancy. 14 MR. COLLINS: The pad here. This is the I?m point to A-302 on the very right-hand side 15 16 is the alley. There?s a wall that?s to be put in with 17 a parking garage door type of a thing. And a parking 18 pad that sits flat, that sits over the hill that goes It?s almost the grade that -- the elevation of 19 20 the alley in the rear is almost one full floor above 21 the elevation in the front of the building. 2.2 So, the severe slop and all the slope takes place in the back of the building. So, it?s all 23 24 back there. It?s about 30 feet. So, you couldn?t

That?s the practical difficulty.

park there.

25

You

1	cannot park there.
2	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: But isn?t there
3	a practical difficulty that you need to identify for
4	having that extension in the lot occupancy to begin
5	with? It would be that you don?t have a place to
6	park. Is that right?
7	MR. COLLINS: That?s right.
8	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: And parking is
9	desirable?
10	MR. COLLINS: Right. And that?s the
11	practicalthere?s no place. We cannot provide
12	parking anywhere on the site without that parking pad.
13	That?s the practical difficulty.
14	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. I?m just
15	trying to fit it into the variance test.
16	But is the reason that you want to provide
17	that because it?s ?desirable? to have parking or
18	because it?s an economic difficulty if you can?t sell
19	parking with a
20	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: I?m confused as to why
21	we?re asking them to tell us what the reason is to
22	provide it as part of the variance test?
23	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I?m trying to
24	figure the practical difficulty if they don?t.
25	MR. COLLINS: The practical difficulty is

1	the inability to provide parking anywhere on the site.
2	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: And the slope at the
3	rear.
4	MR. COLLINS: Parking is not required.
5	The credits, the parking credits that are available
6	from the school use far outweigh the parking
7	requirement for this four-unit building. So,
8	therefore, no parking is required.
9	However, we want to provide it, but the
10	only place to provide it is on level or fairly level
11	surface. There is no level surface that is on private
12	property.
13	We have several options to do it. One is
14	to put the parking pad from the alley, which makes the
15	most sense because everyone else has parking from the
16	alley who does have parking in that square. The other
17	option would be to put a parking garage door in the
18	front of the building which clearly in an historic
19	building like this would not be acceptable. And the
20	third option would be also not acceptable to park in a
21	driveway in front of the building, which the historic
22	preservation
23	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Right.
24	MR. COLLINS: didn?t like time and time
25	again.

you

I heard

VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: far as there are practical difficulty in suffer the practical difficulty? The owner of the building? Somebody in a unit? Who would-the practical difficulty. MR. COLLINS: to provide. VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: MR. COLLINS:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

providing parking anywhere else other than that place. My question is, if you don?t provide the parking at all in that place, you would need to get a variance from the lot occupancy there. Who would

As I understand the practical difficulty test in that context, the practical difficulty goes to the physical practical difficulty in providing what you?re trying

Okay.

If you can?t put the parking anywhere else but that. If you couldn?t put a deck anywhere except in the rear yard. If you couldn?t put your kitchen anywhere except in the side yard.

As long as a variance is not person to the Applicant. That?s not our situation here. It?s not for reasons personal to the Applicant. It?s the practical difficulty of being physically unable to put parking anywhere on that site without having to put this pad on which increase lot occupancy. That?s our practical difficulty.

1 VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Thank 2 you. 3 MR. COLLINS: Okay. We went through this with 4 MR. HURTEAU: 5 the neighbors too at the ANC meeting about that. when I spoke to Kindy French we went over different 6 7 types of design of this. Because the alley is filled with parking spaces back there. It?s pretty much what 8 the majority of the alley is. And so if you want to 9 make sure that the part over that is brick, and so on 10 so I went over that and I?11 go over that further if 11 12 everything is approved with the historical people. But it wouldn?t deviate from -- in other words, if you 13 14 look at it from the back alley, it?s not going to deviate from the other properties around it. 15 16 Right now there?s an existing wall. You 17 can?t tell behind that wall that there?s a drop. And then that existing wall would have a type of garage 18 19 type door, without a garage. And then a brick 20 surround. 21 So, basically the practical appearance of 2.2 it is basically you see these garage door and then you see our brick wall. Instead of all brick wall, it?s 23 brick surround with a garage door. 24

Most people have no idea behind there that

there?s that drop. So, the appearance from the rest of the houses. That?s one of the things my neighbors, none of seem to have any objection. In fact, they?d like to see a var up the street instead of taking another spot.

For two or three units, if I were to do two or three units in this property, the bottom line is economics. It?s just they would have to be, if I had larger units, they would sell less per square foot. And that was far less per square foot without the parking.

There gets to be a point of which when it?s closer to 1,000 square feet where it?s almost expected and it?s usually a bonus if it has parking and you usually charge accordingly for that.

Incidentally, when I bought my parking space, I bought a condo parking space on 21st Street and this is seven years ago. I paid \$50,000 for an outdoor space, just because it?s--my house doesn?t have it and I wanted to have parking and I was offered a lot more money for it when I recently sold that house. And so it?s a valuable thing, but where the condo at 1721 21st Street is, most of the units there do not have parking, but they still sell quickly without out. They are mostly 1,000 square feel or

less.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

Basically, if the project were to be made into two or three units, it?s just not--it?s two and a half million to buy the property and with the cost of construction to make it two or three units, because of the price per square foot of selling the other large units without parking, it?s just not feasible.

I?m not buying this to make --to build a big profit. In fact, what I?m trying to do is just to defer the cost. Not defer the cost but lower the cost of my living in my unit by selling the other units.

basically, it But would iust be prohibitively expensive if I had two other larger units selling for less for that the versus It just doesn?t--the cost construction costs. if prohibitive for that.

MEMBER ETHERLY: Mr. Chair, if I could follow up on that question from Ms. Miller.

I think perhaps the struggle is, maybe not so much of a struggle but trying to illustrate, is the difference between the sale price in a two to three units building compared to what you?re proposing such that it creates an entirely unacceptable or downright ludicrous absence of a return on your investment. Or is it the case that it just allows you to --it would

1	result in selling the units for a lesser amount
2	understood than what you would be able to sell them
3	for in a four-unit building.
4	Perhaps the challenge is trying to get a
5	sense of what your break-even point is because I think
6	we probably have a little bit of an absence of data in
7	terms of what is your starting point? What is your
8	break-even point? And where does it just absolutely
9	go down hill for you financially?
10	MR. HURTEAU: Sure. Well, let?s look at
11	numbers.
12	The price of the property was two and half
13	million. Construction costs were going to be a
14	minimum 1.5 million. That?s 4 million. The sales of
15	the units are probably going to be around somewhere
16	between what I?ll get from them is somewhere between
17	1.5 and 1.7 million.
18	Basically, if I do the project as it is,
19	and I were to sell my own unit, I would break even on
20	the project and not make any profit. Anything other
21	than that would be pretty much a loss.
22	MEMBER ETHERLY: And that would be if,
23	when you say if you did 1.5 to 1.7 million per unit in
24	what would be a what, a four-unit building?
25	MR. HURTEAU: A four-unit building.

2 MR. HURTEAU: 1.5 to 1.7 for the total 3 sale of the other three units. MEMBER ETHERLY: Okay. . 4 5 MR. HURTEAU: And then the--then my unit itself would probably be worth somewhere around 2 to 6 7 say maybe 2.2 or something like that or 2.3. basically, I?m looking at breaking even or possibly 8 losing money. But the reason why I did this. When I 9 went into this property, I went up to the terrace 10 11 that?s up there on the top level. And it has this 12 incredible view of the entire city. It is gorgeous. 13 I saw that and I thought I have to have this building. 14 I really want to move into this property and I want 15 to make it work. 16 And I talked to neighbors. I talked to 17 Greg as an architect and I consulted many people 18 before doing that. But I saw that and I thought I 19 really would love to live here. 20 One thought was to maybe have it as a school and have it for awhile and down the road 21 2.2 possibly convert it later on. But I thought No. really like to live there. It?s a great space. 23 24 So, as the current numbers qo, I?m likely to break even or possible lose a little bit in value. 25

MEMBER ETHERLY:

Okay.

But for me it?s a trade off because I love that view. 1 2 It?s going to be a great space when it?s done. 3 MEMBER ETHERLY: Okay. And I?m going to enjoy 4 HURTEAU: 5 living there. MEMBER ETHERLY: Okay. So a very important 6 7 point. As the project is currently proposed, you 8 are literally as you said at break even or even a 9 little bit below. 10 11 MR. HURTEAU: Yes. 12 MEMBER ETHERLY: If you were to drop to three units or two units, obviously that purchase 13 14 price for those units would have to rise and it?s your testimony that that would be a very highly unlikely 15 16 scenario for a potential purchaser looking at this 17 particular property in this particular market based on your experience with the market over the years. 18 MR. HURTEAU: And the price would have to 19 20 be adjusted to account for the lack of parking for 21 those larger units. 2.2 MEMBER ETHERLY: Okay. And have you put 23 together any data or run through specifically the construction side of this? Maybe that begin to merge 24 25 us into the architectural presentation or another

1	portion of the testimony. But have you put together
2	an indication of kind of what the construction costs
3	that you?re looking at? Is that 1.5 a firm number or
4	are there any corners that you can cut there to get it
5	down to \$500,000?
6	MR. HURTEAU: Well, actually, I consulted.
7	Right now, I basically didn?t spend as much time
8	doing thewe?re working on the final plans, but until
9	this happens today, I didn?t want to jump 100 percent
10	into it.
11	So, basically, the preliminary figures and
12	these are only preliminary from two different
13	construction companies, the Lee Group and Vogan
14	construction bot said it?s going to be at least \$1.5
15	million.
16	Now, often times those numbers don?t go
17	down, but they go up unfortunately.
18	MEMBER ETHERLY: Okay.
19	MR. HURTEAU: So, it could become more
20	expensive.
21	MEMBER ETHERLY: Okay. And let me jump,
22	if I could, to Mr. Kearley very quickly because there
23	was an exchange you had with Ms. Miller on the issue
24	of the former school use. And I just wanted to
25	perhaps put a pin in something that you said.

1	Inac is the issue of the cost that would
2	be entailed for a particulara potential school user
3	to purchase this property and get it up to code. You
4	said code compliance.
5	Is it your sense that based on our
6	awareness, familiarity with this property, that there
7	would indeed be a significant amount of code
8	compliance work that would have to be done? This
9	could not be a turnkey purchase for any school that
10	would seek to operate in this building?
11	MR. HURTEAU: Someone could move in as is.
12	It?s pretty dated, the design and the finishes and
13	the systems. So, I would think there would need to be
14	substantial work to tailor it to a specific need.
15	This was a school for, I believe, for
16	language.
17	MR. HURTEAU: It was an internship program
18	for Japanese business people coming to the U.S.
19	MEMBER ETHERLY: Okay. So, it was adult
20	business users.
21	MR. HURTEAU: And learning English but
22	typically spaces need to be modified once people move
23	in and new people, you know, people move out and new
24	people move in. And to get it compliant, there would
25	be significant costs to do so.

1	MEMBER ETHERLY: Okay. Thank you.
2	MR. HURTEAU: And it?s also a difficult
3	situation when you?re dealing with an historic
4	neighborhood too to make things compliant.
5	MEMBER ETHERLY: Okay. Thank you.
6	Yes, sir.
7	MR. HURTEAU: If I might add, there?s no
8	sprinklers in the building. It?s one unit air
9	conditioning. I plan on adding sprinkler as part of
10	my conversion.
11	MEMBER ETHERLY: Okay. Thank you. Thank
12	you, Mr. Chair.
13	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I?m sorry. Just
14	wanted to ask one more followup question on the
15	parking so I have the whole picture.
16	Have you decided, is the parking pat for
17	you is it going to be
18	MR. HURTEAU: Yes.
19	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: for a tenant?
20	Oh, it?s for you.
21	MR. HURTEAU: It?s for me.
22	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: so, it?s not
23	really related to the economic question?
24	MR. HURTEAU: If I resell the unit it
25	would be.

1	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Oh, if you
2	resell. Right.
3	MR. HURTEAU: Yes.
4	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Thank
5	you.
6	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Anything else?
7	MR. COLLINS: Just finally, Mr. Hurteau,
8	you have read and are familiar with the statement of
9	the Applicant that was submitted in the BZA
10	application here today?
11	MR. HURTEAU: Yes.
12	MR. COLLINS: Do you adopt this as your
13	testimony?
14	MR. HURTEAU: I do.
15	MR. COLLINS: Okay.
16	Now, Mr. Kearley, would you please
17	identify yourself for the record and proceed with your
18	testimony?
19	MR. KEARLEY: My name is Greg Kearley.
20	I?m the principal of Inscape Studio. And we?re
21	located at 1215 Connecticut Avenue in the District.
22	We touch bases on a lot of architectural
23	questions just in the testimony of Vince and the
24	dialogue that we?ve had. I?ll talk just briefly on a
25	couple of items.

23

24

25

I think first there was a question someone had on the elevator. Do you want me to go through that? Or is that something that?s been resolved?

MR. MANN: Well, perhaps you can start by explaining what the purpose of the elevator is.

MR. KEARLEY: The purpose of the elevator is for the main unit which is the owner?s unit since this is a six-story building and everyone does enter on the first floor, it?s a convenience for the particular unit.

MR. MANN: And do I understand the plans correctly that the elevator opens only onto that unit?

MR. KEARLEY: Only onto that unit. And if you look at the basement plan, which is A101, that?s where the elevator pit and any mechanical systems that go along with that will be located. And then the is the first floor that it becomes first floor So, the basement area is where we?re operational. going to have the elevator pit and the hydraulics and if there?s any machine room, there?s a closet next the elevator pit that we can use as the machine room if I mean, we haven?t as Vince has noted we needed. and detailed and haven?t gone through done engineering on these items until we know if this is a viable project. But the plan is that we?re going to

1	use the basement and then it starts on the first floor
2	and it serve only Unit Number 4 which is the owner?s
3	unit.
4	MR. MANN: And can you explain the code
5	requirements for having the elevator in the building?
6	MR. KEARLEY: I don?t believe there is a
7	code requirement. If you have a building that?s over
8	threeand this I think contradicts something that
9	we?ve written in here, but maybe someone on the Board
10	might have some knowledge on this.
11	If you have aif you?re in a residential
12	multi-family above three floors or four floors or
13	above, you need to have an elevator by code.
14	MR. KEARLEY: Well, first of all, let me
15	put on the submission, the written submission does say
16	the building code requires that there be an elevator
17	in the building. But explain
18	MR. KEARLEY: Exactly. The reasonit?s a
19	gray area here and what it is is when you?ve above
20	three stories, which we are, and it?s a multi-family
21	use, you?re required to have an elevator by code.
22	Okay. But we?re accessing a particular unit on the
23	first floor, not on the fourth floor. And so whether
24	or notthe gray area is whether or not it complies
25	whether or not since you?re entering on the first

floor, since it?s not an egress situation, it?s not an 1 2 elevator for that. But it is a convenience elevator 3 within this particular unit. So, even though we?re going to the fourth 4 and fifth floor, we?re still accessing the unit from 5 the first floor. So, that?s why I don?t think that we 6 7 need to have that to be code compliant. MR. MANN: And are there--8 MR. KEARLEY: Does that make sense? 9 Ts that sort of clear since we?re not--10 MR. HURTEAU: I think actually it?s a code 11 12 gray area because generally it doesn?t state specifically for a project like this. So, I think 13 14 what Greg is saying, there could be a chance that this There may be a chance 15 could be an exception to that. to be an exception to an elevator because egress is 16 17 from the first floor. There?s some buildings where a unit you 18 can only get to it. It starts on the fourth floor and 19 20 there must be an elevator access to get up to that 21 because the beginning of that apartment is on the 2.2 fourth floor. 23 MR. KEARLEY: Exactly. MR. HURTEAU: So, an elevator would be 24 definitively before code. 25

8

11 12

13

10

15

16

14

17 18

19

20

22

21

23

25

24

So, I think what Greg is saying is because

access is on the first floor, there could be an

exception to that rule because even though there is a

fourth floor and a fifty floor, there could be an

exception to this. General thought is that it must be

to code to have an elevator there. But I think what

Greg is saying that even though despite what we wrote,

there could be an exception to that since egress is

already from the first floor.

MR. MANN: Well, I guess the question that results from this then is, is there an alternative place that the elevator could be placed in the building. And does that matter in regard to the relief that you?re requesting anyway?

Ι MR. COLLINS: there is not an alternative because the proposed code already counts lot occupancy. It?s the most logical, setting aside the regulations, from logic, it?s the most logical place to put it. It?s a cut out in the footprint of the building that counts in lot occupancy that we can?t use for any purpose. It?s not a light shaft. It doesn?t provide anything or maybe at one point it was a light shaft, but those regulations are long in the past. And so it makes the most sense to put it here.

The only other option is to leave this 1 2 closed court open to have no purpose and then blast 3 through six levels of slab to retrofit an elevator in. 4 MR. HURTEAU: s. Economically, too, it 5 would be quite a bit more costly to have to cut Whereas, that?s already through the building. 6 7 considered part of the square footage. But if you look here, it?s merely this 8 part added and if you look behind us you?ll see it?s 9 not visible from the street where it says number one. 10 MR. KEARLEY: Just to be clear on the code 11 12 compliance. I don?t believe we need to have an 13 elevator to be code compliant. If we are entering the 14 owner?s unit on the fourth floor, we would need an elevator to be code compliant. Since we?re entering 15 16 it on the first floor, I do not believe we need to 17 have an elevator to be code compliant. 18 But because of the nature of the building and of it being six levels, it?s a situation where it 19 20 seems to me that it?s a logical step to take with 21 having a residence that is five levels above grade and six in totality. 2.2 23 MR. MANN: Okay. Thank you. 24 CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Thank you. Anything 25 else?

1	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: No.
2	Could you fresh my memory then.
3	How is the elevator related to the
4	variance relief?
5	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: It?s an addition to a
6	nonconforming, and of course that already counts for
7	lot occupancy.
8	MR. KEARLEY: It?s an addition we?re
9	making to the building and because it?s an existing
LO	nonconforming building that exceeds lot occupancy,
L1	you?re automatically required to get a variance from
L2	any additions that you make.
L3	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. So, and
L4	then this addition then is because it?s desirable?
L5	It?s not because there?s a
16	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: You?re asking why you
L7	have to do it?
L8	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Yes. I know
L9	there?s a practical difficulty again and this
20	situation may be putting it somewhere else. Is there
21	a practical difficulty that these two seeking the
22	variance for the elevator?
23	MR. HURTEAU: Well, actually, I?d like to
24	just comment on the two.
25	Speaking about the very tall units that

for houses that are for sale that have had trouble is that an elevator would help greatly the resale. Even though this will be a condo, it?s still a multi-level condo. That would be my unit. And that would help for resale.

The main reason why I was looking at the elevator is that my parents may move in at some point too and that was my main reason for originally wanting that in there. But for economically, if this unit were resold at some point, I don?t plan to resell it, but if I did, because it has so many floors, if you came in there on the first floor and then the top part of the apartment is on the fifth floor, that?s quite a shlep to go up there. And if I were to resell the unit, then I think having so many levels without an elevator, I think, would be to its resale detriment.

MR. COLLINS: Let me add to that. The practical difficulty here is the test and we could eliminate the need for the variance if we could take off the back part of the building and comply with the lot occupancy, but we can?t. We can?t. It?s 75 percent now. The requirement, because this is in the all other category, the requirement is 40 percent.

So, we would have to take the back half of the building and demolish it in order to be allowed to

2.2

1	add to it, which is kind of, you know, intuitive. But
2	if we were allowed to take off that much of the
3	building, that would allow us to fill in this closed
4	court with the elevator shaft without having to see a
5	variance from that.
6	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Anything else?
7	Mr. Kearley, you made a statement about
8	the schools in comparison with occupancy and the
9	different code and it may not beI?m not sure you
10	asserted that you knew exactly the entire code
11	compliance would have to come in within a
12	Am I understanding you correct that this
13	is, you know, three quarter of its life of the
14	building has been a school. If a new school moved in
15	now, there would have to be accommodations that would
16	not have had to be done 10 years or 20 years ago
17	according to building code?
18	MR. KEARLEY: I believe it would probably
19	be related to the amount of renovation that happened
20	on the place.
21	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: But the building code,
22	I guess, directlyhas the building code changed in
23	the last four years?
24	MR. KEARLEY: It has changed. It changes
25	every three years or so.

1	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: So, conceivably, it?s
2	more restrictive where there are changes that have
3	come in to play.
4	MR. KEARLEY: Exactly. ADA particularly
5	in terms of accessibility and those types of issues.
6	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Egress would be
7	required in an assembly space in a building at this
8	time
9	MR. KEARLEY: You would need two means of
LO	egress that would be enclosed means of egress.
11	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Tell me where
12	MR. KEARLEY: I don?t believe there?s any
13	that are in existence that need code because it?s an
14	open communicating stair which takes you up and down
15	the space. It?s not an enclosed space. And so I
16	thinkI don?t believe it would be compliant the way
17	it is.
18	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: So, if I understand
19	your testimony about this building code business, a
20	school is coming ina new school is coming, even
21	though there?s a special exception from this Board to
22	allow that, building code would require additional
23	modifications, if not structural alterations of the
24	buildingin order to comply with the assembly space

on all those floors?

1	MR. KEARLEY: Exactly. Exactly.
2	COURT REPORTER: Would you move your mike
3	a little closer.
4	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Sure.
5	MR. KEARLEY: Typically, you need two
6	means of egress when you?re in a place of assembly
7	that?s over three stories. And right now the one
8	means of egress is not an enclosed means of egress.
9	It?s the original stair that?s been there. And it?s
10	not a rated enclosure for that means of egress. So,
11	we don?t have
12	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: So, is it your
13	testimony that the building actually include at this
14	pointlot occupancy for the school depending on
15	MR. KEARLEY: By the strict letter of the
16	law, I don?t believe that you should be able to get a
17	certificate of occupancy based on the current
18	arrangement of the space.
19	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Okay.
20	MR. HURTEAU: If I might add too when the
21	existing people bought this in 1992, basically when
22	people getrenew their license and get the C of O
23	changed, sometimes inspection happens, sometimes it
24	doesn?t. To my knowledge, there was no inspection of

the premises at that point and had there been, there

1	could have been other changes.
2	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Who are you talking
3	about that bought it in 2002?
4	MR. HURTEAU: The people I got it from,
5	the Japanese
6	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Oh, I see.
7	MR. HURTEAU: So, in other words, had some
8	type of inspection occurred with them, I think they
9	could havethere could have been some compliance
10	issues.
11	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Well, could perhaps the
12	inspection only been invoked if there was a permit
13	pulled for construction on the building?
14	MR. HURTEAU: Possibly.
15	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Okay.
16	MR. HURTEAU: Possibly. Yes.
17	But to my knowledge, there was no such
18	inspection. But if anything were to happen with this
19	property while they had it or, you know, they
20	basically took their chances, I think while they had
21	it because having it as they did, the open staircase
22	and not being ADA compliant and so on.
23	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Okay.
24	Yes, Ms. Miller?
25	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I just have one

more question.

2.2

With respect to residential properties, I think you testified it?s certainly for a single family, six floors is unusual. But is there some floor level where elevators are pretty much common because, even if they?re not required by code, they?re found to be necessary?

MR. HURTEAU: Are you talking about in residential--

VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: In residential.

MR. HURTEAU: My experience is that like in the Hillendale development which is north of Georgetown Hospital, they build some four-level townhouses there. And what they did there and also in another project was they had an elevator auction and they had a closet that was on each floor so you could put an elevator in because of having four total level, they wanted to have it. So, people could easily put in an elevator so they had four closets in a row up and down. So, you could put one in or the developer could install one when they were purchased brand new.

So, often times for new construction, I?ve seen that if it is three or four levels, I?ve never seen residential new construction with five levels.

But I?ve seen resales of five levels and I?ve never

T	seem a six-level single-lamily dwelling.
2	But places that are new construction,
3	often times I?ve seen elevators on the higher end,
4	elevators as an option.
5	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: So, resales with
6	five levels, do they put in elevators?
7	MR. HURTEAU: There?s a place for sale
8	right now, 1854 Biltmore that just came on the market
9	that has five levels. They did install an elevator
10	there.
11	My neighbor at 2113 S Street that?s been
12	for sale for a long time with five levels, they do not
13	have an elevator, although it?s fully renovated.
14	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Thank
15	you.
16	MR. HURTEAU: Sure.
17	MR. KEARLEY: I just wanted to wrap up
18	testimony very quickly here.
19	I don?t think we need to go into the size
20	of the units we?ve talked about and necessarily the
21	layout of the units and those types of things.
22	One final role I played as architect was
23	working with Steve Calcott and talking to him at
24	historic and he has told us that what we?re doing he
25	will put as the consent calendar. So, if something
	II

1	were historic, has seen the plans and the elevations.
2	We?re going to restore the facade to its original
3	intent with new wood windows that are compliant with
4	Steve?s wishes at historic. And we?re told that we?ll
5	be on the consent calendar.
6	So, that?s something else that we?re
7	trying to do to the building is to really bring it up
8	to what is expected by the city and the neighborhood.
9	MR. HURTEAU: If I might add to that, too.
10	I was going to originally have, I thought
11	erroneously that the second floor hadon the second
12	floor I erroneously thought they had sort of double
13	glass french doors there, three sets across. And I
14	talked to Steve about that. He found a photo of the
15	house actually and he said on that floor there were
16	nine panes over nine panes. And so on the second
17	level of windows, double hung and so I pretty much
18	planned to do it exactly as to how the photo is.
19	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Great. Anything else?
20	Follow up? Questions.
21	All right. We?ll have time for other
22	anything else at this time?
23	MR. COLLINS: Yes. One final question.
24	Mr. Kearley, you have read the Applicant?s
25	statement that was submitted to the Board in this

1 case. 2 MR. KEARLEY: Yes. I have. 3 MR. COLLINS: And with the exception of the comment that was noted about the elevator, do you 4 5 adopt this as your testimony? 6 MR. KEARLEY: Yes. 7 MR. COLLINS: Thank you. CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Excellent. Then let?s 8 move ahead to Office of Planning. Let?s see if there 9 10 is a mike down there works. 11 MORPHIN: Good afternoon, MR. Mr. 12 My name is Steven Mordfin with the Office Chairman. 13 of Planning. 14 And the building on the subject property 15 consists of 9,024 square feet and although large, 16 there are several other one-family residential row 17 houses in the surrounding area with similar square 18 footage ranging in size from 8,226 to 8,682 square feet of gross building area. 19 20 The cowhouse at 2111 S Street 21 converted back to a one-family dwelling that was the 2.2 application to convert subject of а BZAit 23 apartments and the Applicant testified that there were 24 economic constraints related to converting it back to

single-family use.

Ì	114
1	In this case, although the application
2	indicates that there are economic constraints
3	regarding converting the building back to single
4	family use, no data was submitted supporting this
5	claim. Therefore, the Office of Planning does not
6	find the subject property to be affected by an
7	extraordinary exceptional situation and cannot support
8	the use variance request.
9	The application also requests variance for
10	leave from the maximum lot occupancy permitted and a
11	variance to allow for the enlargement of a
12	nonconforming structure. As these variances are to
13	accommodate a use variance that the Office of Planning
14	does not support, the Office of Planning cannot then
15	support these two variance requests.
16	The Office of Planning recommends denial
17	of the application as submitted for apartments.
18	However, the Office of Planning does not object to a
19	variance that would allow for a flat, a use that would
20	be more consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.
21	And that concludes the presentation from
22	the Office of Planning.
23	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Excellent. Thank you
24	very much.

You?ve heard a

25

additional

lot of

information present today. 1 Does that to 2 additionally the data that you were thinking 3 needed and would that change your opinion? And, secondly, could you just talk a 4 little bit more about the difference between a flat, a 5 two-unit and a four-unit and how that is impacted in 6 7 terms of a use variance test that we have before us? understand your comment about 8 Comprehensive Plan, but here we are looking at the 9 variance test and it doesn?t seem to me that it makes 10 much difference whether it would be a two-unit or a 11 12 four-unit. 13 MR. MORPHIN: Okay. With regards to 14 whether it was a flat or a four-unit, the property is zoned R-3 which doesn?t permit either, as you?re 15 A flat is first permitted in the R-4 zone 16 17 district which is the next zone district up. A four-unit building is not permitted in 18 the R-4 zone. It?s not permitted until you get to the 19 20 R-5, unless you?re doing a conversion, which is based 21 on 900 square feet of lot area per unit which this lot 2.2 doesn?t have in order to --if it were R-4, you still wouldn?t get more than two units as a matter of right 23 as a conversion. 24

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

So, therefore, based on that we see that

there is a difference between a flat and a four-unit 1 2 and that you?re going from R-3 to R-5 to get to the 3 four-unit building. 4 CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Ι quess can 5 understand that in terms of the perspective of looking 6 at the varying density or compatibility with the 7 Comprehensive Plan. But in order to get to support a flat, wouldn?t you have to get through a use variance? 8 And if you got to the use, wouldn?t you then have 9 said that they were persuasive and they?re meeting the 10 11 test of uniqueness and then hardship? 12 MR. MORPHIN: Yes. I agree. You would need the use variance in order to establish a flat on 13 14 that property. 15 CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: I guess directly then, 16 do you think they meet that test, but that you differ 17 with the density in terms of unit? 18 MR. MORPHIN: I differ with the density in unit, also because of the size of the 19 Although it?s large, it?s not that much 20 building. 21 larger than other ones in the area, but it?s still the 2.2 largest that I was able to locate if were to be converted to single family use. I think it would be 23 the largest single-family dwelling in the surrounding 24 25 area.

1	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Okay.
2	MR. MORPHIN: And because of that, we
3	could supportthe Office of Planning could support a
4	flat because it is the largest. I mean, at some point
5	it is going to cut off at some point. Where does it
6	break?
7	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Okay. I?m just trying
8	to put you to clarity and not questioning your
9	analysis.
10	But what I?m understanding you saying I
11	think then is that based on the uniqueness of the
12	size. You?ve said it?s the largest. That there would
13	be some sort of hardship in making it single family.
14	But that the two units goes to the level or the
15	threshold from your analysis that fits within the one,
16	you could say, the practicability, but the intent of
17	the zone plan and notis that correct?
18	MR. MORPHIN: That is correct.
19	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Okay. I see. Okay.
20	Indeed.
21	Good. And then the first question. I?m
22	just going directly to the data required further
23	analysis which as I?m understanding now brings us to
24	the difference between two and four units. Have you
25	heard that today and has the Office of Planning?s

position chanced at all from the report?
MR. MORPHIN: Well, that was first that we
heard any numbers on how much it would cost to
actually convert this building and what it would cost
if he converted to a two unit or a four unit and, you
know, whether or not he would break even or make money
or lose money.
As he was accepted as an expert witness in
that field and his numbers saying that, I mean, I
would have to accept them. I can?t attest them. I
don?t know enough about how much it?s going to cost.
I would rely on his expertise.
CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Okay. But does it rise
to a level of changing the opinion?
I wouldn?t be surprised if it doesn?t. I
mean, you know, it?s a spur of a moment here but I?m
just
MR. MORPHIN: Right. It?s on the spur and
I haven?t given it a lot of thought based on the
information that he had said. I?m inclined to think
maybe not, because I haven?t looked at how much it
actually costs and seen his numbers and actually
looked at them on paper besides just hearing them,
just comparing them.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Indeed. But I think

2	MR. MORPHIN: Okay.
3	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Any other questions of
4	the Board? Ms. Miller?
5	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Oh, Mr. Hood.
6	MR. HOOD: Your discussion with Mr.
7	Morphin and the Applicant has provided some additional
8	information today and I was just wonderingI don?t
9	know which way the Board wants to move, but it may be
10	to our best interest, at least for me, to allow Mr.
11	Morphin to look at that, because I really would like
12	to see him evaluate the information that was provided
13	here today, even though it?s like the question you
14	asked him was a spur of the moment. That may be
15	something we may be able to put off until they are
16	able to evaluate that.
17	I would feel more comfortable moving
18	forward in that fashion.
19	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Indeed. I have no
20	difficulty with that, Mr. Hood, if you?d like to give
21	the Office of Planning an opportunity to do a
22	supplemental report, if that?s what you prefer to do.
23	It was very substitutive information that
24	came in, especially the comparisons in sales, but also
25	the comparisons of construction costs and

that sounds very logically.

1	configuration. We may, in fact, have other
2	information that we need into the record.
3	Ms. Miller? Mr. Mann?
4	MR. MANN: You identified several other
5	similar-size row houses used as one-family dwellings
6	in the surrounding area. And then you give several
7	examples and they range in the 82 to 8,600 square feet
8	area.
9	Do you know how many different levels
10	those examples are? How many different floors those
11	row houses are?
12	MR. MORDFIN: No. The database that we
13	pulled that from just gave the gross building area,
14	which is the entire building including the basement.
15	But it does not indicate the floor levels.
16	MR. MANN: Okay. So, the only thing that
17	we know to be certain that?s comparable is this square
18	footage. And each of them is a row house however?
19	MR. MORPHIN: Each is a row house, or an
20	end unit row house, which sometimes are defined as
21	semi-detached by the zoning.
22	MR. MANN: Okay. But we do know for
23	certain that they?re on more than one level by their
24	own
25	MR. MORPHIN: I believe they?refrom

1	having walked this neighborhood in the past, I believe
2	they?re all on one level. I don?t think there are any
3	one-level row houses over there.
4	MR. MANN: Okay.
5	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Well, based on the
6	square footage, they wouldn?t fit on the size that?s
7	MR. MANN: That?s true.
8	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: that would margin
9	that shows for lot sizes.
10	MR. MORPHIN: Yes. So, they have to be
11	more than one level.
12	MR. MANN: Okay. Thank you.
13	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Others?
14	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I?m just a
15	little bit interested in how this use variance would
16	be consistent or notnot inconsistent with the
17	comprehensive plan or inconsistent with it. I
18	understand your point about the four units aren?t
19	allowed until two zones later, but other than that. I
20	mean often sometimes in OP reports we see certain
21	provisions of the Comprehensive Plan cited and that?s
22	not really the case here.
23	You know, and often you can find different
24	parts of the Comprehensive Plan to support different
25	things. But is there something other than jumping

from -- up two zones that?s particularly inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan?

MR. MORPHIN: Well, that was based on the generalized land use map, which is a part of the Comprehensive Plan. And it recommends moderate density residential for that site. And based on that, you know, the R-3 is a moderate density residential zone district, so that works with what?s on that map.

Medium density, the R-5 also is indicated that it begins at R-5B. And so by going into the R-5, then you?re no longer in the moderate density and so we feel the medium density is a lower density residential zone than the--once you?re moved up to a higher residential zone district, you change the comp plan then.

VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Because often when we?re looking at residential applications, we see sections that talk about--I don?t now if this is a Comprehensive Plan not, but increasing the residency in the District of Columbia, that that?s something--and it?s often in certain neighborhoods also that they want to increase residential.

So, in this case, we have a situation where it would be changing from a school to residences. And so I?m just wondering if there?s a

2.2

1	provision in the Comprehensive Plan that would relate
2	to that in this neighborhood?
3	MR. MORPHIN: I don?t know the answer to
4	that, but I can look into that to see what the
5	Comprehensive Plan says about that if anything.
6	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. Thank
7	you.
8	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Isn?t that like the
9	boilerplate in the ward plan. We?re going to support
10	and stabilize our residential base?
11	MR. MORPHIN: Most of the ward plans have
12	a statement in there to stabilize, to improve, to
13	modernize the housing within the ward. Sometimes the
14	Comp Plans basically references specific locations.
15	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Well, there are
16	neighborhood in the overlays, of course, where you
17	have competitive interests and perhaps even matter of
18	right interests and the community may have.
19	I found it fascinating actually because
20	the Applicant uses the same paradigm in comparison in
21	their submission and not aslet?s look at what this
22	is more analogous to or what zone, you know, and talks
23	about the R-5. When we start throwing FAR in,
24	although I found that Office of Planning looked at it
25	more in a negative aspect. Applicant takes it as a

124
positive and it?s kind of strange because actually if
you look at it. This is an existing structure that
the zoning was laid over, you know. It wasn?t as if
it was built within the zoning on development context.
And so it?s almost a nonfor me, it?s not a very
direct or good comparison. And first of all, using
the FAR because you?ve got a large structure and a lot
of these neighborhoods as we know, look at these
applications. The sites are small. And the buildings
are large.
But if you lookI guess this is what it
means. When I start thinking about a four FAR or a

But if you look--I guess this is what it means. When I start thinking about a four FAR or a four and a half FAR or a five FAR or a three FAR, if you start looking at where FARs are actually utilized at that level, above the 1.8, when you start getting into the C zones, and you?re talking about much larger lots. So, you?re talking about much larger buildings and that?s where they are to me is a much more comparable element of measurement as opposed to this.

But that may be more yammering than needed.

Let?s move ahead then. Are there any other questions for Office of Planning?

I think it?s an excellent report and it?s not surprising the position taken by the Office of

2.2

1	Planning. And I think it?s a decidedly solid one in
2	terms of its interpretation of the regulations. And
3	it?s a fairly strict interpretation of it. However, I
4	think there is some room for differing analysis and I
5	think you?ve heard some of that deliberation from the
6	Board?s perspective.
7	Let me ask the Applicant if they have any
8	cross examination of the Office of Planning at this
9	time?
10	MR. COLLINS: No. We do not
11	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Oh, very good. Okay.
12	Let?s move ahead then to any other
13	Government reports attendant to the application.
14	The architect has indicated that this has
15	been reviewed by staff and it is proposed to be put on
16	a consent calendar or perhaps will fall under the
17	historic preservation guideline and laws to be
18	reviewed by staff for permitting.
19	ANC-2D was recommending approval. Exhibit
20	18I don?t see anybody here representing the ANC.
21	However, they can come forward at time if they are.
22	Outside of that, I do not have any other Government
23	reports attendant to the application, unless the Board
24	of Applicant is aware.

We can ask for all those that are here

today if they would come forward to provide testimony 1 2 I Application 17367. 3 Persons in opposition or in favor of the If there?s no one else in the hearing 4 room, perhaps, the building is closed or our signs 5 didn?t get them here. But in any case, they?re not 6 here to provide additional testimony. 7 We can move ahead to any other questions from the Board or we?ll 8 go right into closing? 9 Any other questions? 10 Mr. Collins, let?s hear some rebuttal or 11 12 we?ll go to closing? MR. COLLINS: Rebuttal to the Office of 13 14 Planning is really based upon facts. And I apologize for not having had an 15 16 opportunity to speak to Mr. Mordfin about this. I was 17 away for four days. Just came back last evening. But I?d like to point out some factual differences that I 18 19 have with his report. 20 I?m looking at the page 3 of the report 21 under the heading of Existing Apartment Building Uses. 2.2 And the citation is there to the case immediately to the east of the subject site, the Holten Arms School 23 was turned into eight condominiums. And the OP report 24 25 indicates that the lots size there was 8,500 square

feet, resulting in a density of 1,062.5 square feet 1 2 per unit, which is almost twice that of the subject 3 application. Well, that?s not correct. Actually, the 4 5 lot size in that case was not 8,500 square feet, but 4,250 square feet, because it only dealt with Lot 49 6 7 and not with all three lots. The based atlas map, if I can refer you. I don?t want to jump around too 8 9 much. 10 But if you look at Tab A to the Applicants 11 statement, and you find S Street in that application, 12 if you look immediately above the S in S Street, you will see Lot 810, which is comprised of three lots 13 14 that have a line drawn through them, 12, 49 and 8. subject 15 Well, 49 was the that 16 application for the eight units and that site 17 measures, if you do the math, you can see it?s 50 feet wide and 85 feet deep. That comes to 4,250 square 18 19 feet. 20 CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: I?m sorry, just for 21 clarification. The 810 is the tax lot comprising of 2.2 the--MR. COLLINS: 810 is a tax lot that the 23 developer bought. 24 25 CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Right.

1	MR. COLLINS: He turned former Lot 12 into
2	a single-family dwelling. Built a single-family
3	dwelling on that lot and then Lot 9 was the eastern
4	portion of the old Holten Arms building that was an
5	additional added on later
6	
7	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Right.
8	MR. COLLINS: that they re-established
9	the first wall, bot HPRB approval for a new front door
10	and sold that as a single-family dwelling.
11	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: And so the 8,500 square
12	feet it looks like it?s written under the Lot 810 is
13	actually for all of the lots under 810?
14	MR. COLLINS: All three lots. That?s
15	correct.
16	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: I see.
17	MR. COLLINS: That?s correct. So, the lot
18	size in that BZA application 16497 was only 4,250
19	square feet. So, if you do the math there, dividing
20	4,250 square feet by eight units, the density per unit
21	comes out to 531.25 square foot of land area per unit.
22	That?s exactly the same as what we?re proposing in
23	this application. Exactly the same.
24	If you do that same exercise with the
25	other BZA applications that were cited above under the

1	heading of Prior Board of Zoning Adjustment Actions on
2	page 3, if you do that same math with those three,
3	case number 12762, the land are there was 3,400 square
4	feet. The number of units was 10, resulting in a
5	density of 340 square feet of land area per unit.
6	In Case No. 13348, the land area was 5,550
7	square feet, the number of units was 14. The density
8	425 square feet of land area per unit.
9	Case No. 15161, land area of 1,1700 square
10	feet. The number of units was 5, density 340 square
11	feet of land area per unit.
12	Those are all lower than our land area
13	which is 531.25 feet of square feet of land area per
14	unit for our building, which is exactly the same as
15	what happened next door at 2125 S Street.
16	If you were to take these mathematical
17	look at it another way.
18	Take the building gross floor area and
19	divide by the number of units and see what you get.
20	For the Holten Arms School next door, that
21	building was about 15,000 square feet. The number of
22	units was 8 and so resulting in about 1,875an
23	average unit size 1,875 square feet. Now, there is
24	some weight larger than that and some weight smaller
25	than that. But the average is 1,875.

130 For Case No. 12762, the building size was 1 2 about 11,000 square feet. The number of units was 10. 3 The average size 1,100 square feet per unit average. Case No. 13348, the building gross floor 4 5 area is 15,700 square feet with 14 units. The average unit size 1,121 square feet. 6 7 This case the building size of 9,000 square feet and four units the average unit size is 8 9 2,250 square feet. Now, of course, we have one at 5,000 and the other much smaller. 10 But if you?re 11 talking about average unit size, we are much larger 12 than the average unit size of the other multi-family 13 dwellings on this street. 14 We have the largest--we have exactly the same as the one next door, which are the two largest 15 in terms of land area per unit. So, we?re not lower. 16 17 We?re not smaller than the others. Also, the data that we have available to 18 us from the Office of Tax and Revenue. 19 I?m looking 20 now on page 4 of the Office of Planning report. Under 21 the second paragraph under the heading of 2.2 Analysis, talking about the size of the structure and

We have Office of Tax and Revenue

how this is similar. The subject structure is similar

in size to other structures.

23

24

1	information which differs from what Office of Planning
2	comes up to in terms of numbers and such in terms of
3	size of the building.
4	The OTR website shows 2135 Bancroft as
5	having a living area of 7,548 square feet, which is
6	less than the 8,682 which is listed in the OP report.
7	For 2132 Bancroft, it lists 4,373 square
8	feet which is much less than the 8,226 square feet
9	listed.
10	For 2122 Bancroft, the OTR website lists
11	4,168 square feet, which is much less than the 8,646
12	square feet listed in the OP report.
13	And then finally 2111 Bancroft is listed
14	here as 4,637 square feet and this is living area and
15	this may not be an apples to apples comparison, but in
16	terms of order of magnitude, certainly a big
17	difference.
18	Living area, 4,637 square feet which is
19	much less than the 8,646 square feet.
20	So, the numbers that are used, you know,
21	depending upon the data that you have, can make a big
22	difference. So, our building is 9,000 square feet.
23	Much, much bigger than these others.
24	The next paragraph down, the third
25	paragraph with the Office of Planning report talks

about 2111 S Street as being converted back to single-family dwelling use showing it to determine--to show that we could also do the same thing. Well, that?s not correct either. That lot size for 2111 S is 1,700 square feet. I don?t have the information on the building size, but it was a three-story and partial fourth floor--three story building, partial fourth floor.

Even assuming that the lot occupancy was 80 percent, which it probably was not, but probably less. But even assuming it was 80 percent, that would result in a building of about 4,100 square feet for a single-family dwelling. That?s not unusual certainly. But ours is 9,000. Twice that.

I think, Mr. Chair, you touched on the fact that this is a zoning category that?s been overlaid on top of a building that was already 35 years old or more when the zoning came in in 1958. I?m sorry, no. 48 years old.

It?s an existing building in the historic district. There?s nothing we can do about the density of the building. There?s nothing we can do about the prior uses. The building certainly does not comply with a bunch of things, FAR, lot occupancy, but that?s just the way it was built. Zoning came in later and

2.2

in an effort to make the lines straight and not have to jag here or there, they put this in the R-3 Zone. It?s not an R-3 building. It hasn?t been an R-3 use. The building already exists.

the bottom of page 5, the last paragraph on the bottom of page 5 points out on 2125 on the issue of parking at 2125 S Street. Says that the building next door to 2125 S Street provides one parking space for two-thirds of its units. There are 8 units in there with 5 parking spaces. It?s close to It?s five eighths. two-thirds. But the fact is, there are three units that have no parking. And that?s what we?ll have. We?ll have three units with no parking.

The prior use here was a school that had no parking with 200 students plus faculty and staff on top of that.

We have an ANC report. The ANC, which one would think might be the one most directly affected by the shortage of parking, which unanimously supported this application to turn the school into a four-unit condo because they know that the traffic impact, the parking impact will be much, much less from this proposal.

And that concludes -- that?s my rebuttal on

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

the OP report.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

Mr. Hurteau, I believe, has some points and some documentation that he wanted to submit into the record in rebuttal.

MR. HURTEAU: Yes. On page 3 and under Prior Board of Zoning Adjustment Actions, number 2. No, number 1. It talks about 2115 and 2117 S Street that the parking program was established to allow the owners of each unit to lease up to 10 spaces in the universal building.

What I did was I pulled up all the records of sales in that building that exists. It goes back, I think, about five years, of which every single one said street for parking.

Here?s developers it?s what do and basically a bunch of BS. What they do is they go in and pay a large amount to an office building saying I want parking spaces so I can sell my units with parking and get permission from the BZA. tell them that, but they basically go in and they something like, some outrageous amount per parking space so they can get a group of parking spaces with that property. It?s done for a year at a time and the people who live in the building have the chance to rent it afterwards at that exorbitant rate which they typically don?t.

2.2

So, what I did was I pulled up every sale in that building, 2115 and 2117, last figures, and not one of them had rental parking available.

What happens is, developers can go into buildings, office buildings, and basically say, well, I want to rent parking and typically the buildings say no. Only for tenants. Well, what number can I up that to that you allow me to do that for a year? And so typically they can up the number per parking space in those buildings so that way they can have it for a year and the developer will sometimes pay for it or subsidize it.

So, one of two things can happen. One is they can go to a place like a BZA and say, see. I?m providing parking for my building. They can also entice people to buy in the building saying we have rental parking available. But what happens is after one year of that, the tenants usually do not choose to pay an exorbitant amount for parking after that point. Sometimes it can be as much as double.

I pulled up the records of every sale in that building in the multiple listing that goes back as far as the multiple listing has records for that which is about, I think, about five years. Not one of

them had rental parking or said rental parking
available for it.
Basically, as I understand it, a year
after conversion of that building, basically the
parking was over.
CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Why does it help your
case?
MR. HURTEAU: What they were pointing out
was that I don?t have parking, that they had parking.
They made parking available. I could do the same
thing. I could go to the universal building and offer
\$400 per space and make it seem like, have the
appearance that I?m providing parking. But it?s
baloney. I?m not going to do that because after a
year it?s going to be gone and the neighborhood is no
better off for it.
CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: I don?t know that we
need that into the record.
MR. HURTEAU: Okay.
CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Let me just be clear
also that if you were to come in and you had accessory
parking, it would be another type of relief sought
from the Board.
MR. HURTEAU: Okay.
CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: I have never been on a

case where we didn?t have an extension of a lease that had to be provided that we knew how long it was going to be in existence or not. But I understand your point.

MR. HURTEAU: Okay.

MR. HURTEAU: Yes. Several other things about this is a developer who had looked at this, I?m sure, to make a profit, this would have to be--it?s 9,000 square feet. So, this would have to be a lot more units. This building is a eye sore. It has these window unit air conditioners sticking out of the windows. It has vinyl windows. As it currently looks it?s an eye sore.

The neighbors have been overwhelming supportive of it because I want to make it a residence, as a place where I want to live. I want to make it a really nice place.

If basically if it?s to be profitable, it would have to be a lot of units than what it is. But I like the building enough that I?m willing to take the chance and possibly lose money if I resell it. But I want to live there a long time. I want to make it something really nice. And I want it to establish

2.2

1	the point of enough units to try and make it so it
2	would have a chance of breaking even.
3	But basically fewer than that, it?s
4	definitely going to be a loss and an economic
5	hardship.
6	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Thank you.
7	MR. COLLINS: I have copies, Mr. Chairman,
8	of theon the website that I would like to submit to
9	the record.
10	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Good.
11	MR. COLLINS: If I may? Mr. Mordfin has a
12	copy as well.
13	And I believe Mr. Hurteau hashe has
14	copies of documentation supporting the points that he
15	made earlier in rebuttal and we?d like to submit those
16	to the record as well.
17	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Not the whole box.
18	Right?
19	MR. COLLINS: Well, it?s one thing for
20	each.
21	What I did was and some haveeach exhibit
22	there are six exhibits and each have a synopsis, a
23	brief synopsis so you don?t have to go through it.
24	But what I did was I copiesthe longest one is a deed
25	records for Bancroft which has 30 out of 30 single-

1	family houses. And then showing the 45 deeds of S
2	Street which shows of that the overwhelming majority
3	are condos. But you can just read the one-page
4	synopsis for each. That?s a total of six pages that?s
5	in the front of each exhibit.
6	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Or paragraph.
7	MR. COLLINS: Paragraph. It?s pretty much
8	a paragraph per exhibit or couple paragraphs per
9	exhibit.
10	So, if you want to throw in the rest
11	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: You weren?t counting on
12	a bench decision, were you?
13	MR. COLLINS: We?re prepared to rebut.
14	MR. HURTEAU: Yes.
15	MR. COLLINS: Give one to the Office of
16	Planning.
17	MR. HURTEAU: Okay.
18	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Thank you very much.
19	Okay. Mr. Collins, what else do we need?
20	MR. COLLINS: I believe that?s it, Mr.
21	Chair. I think that we did submit substantial
22	evidence and testimony to support our request for a
23	variance relief in this application. And realizing
24	that we did submit some information here, we?d like
25	your positive vote at the earliest possible date.

1	Thank you.
2	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Good. Thank you very
3	much.
4	Board Members, let me hear from you. We
5	had discussed briefly keeping the record open for a
6	supplemental report from Office of Planning. I have
7	gotten perhaps some off the record comments that
8	there?s an awful lot sufficient in this record to move
9	ahead.
10	Let me hear in terms of setting a
11	schedule.
12	As I look at this, this has been very
13	productive, I think, in terms of the oral testimony
14	that?s been provided today.
15	A couple of important points have been hit
16	and I won?t summarize why. We can save that for
17	deliberation. But let me hear from others.
18	MEMBER ETHERLY: Thank you very much, Mr.
19	Chair.
20	I would agree with you that perhaps at the
21	outset of this hearing there were indeed some
22	outstanding questions that needed to be aired out and
23	I think from at least my own perspective, some of
24	those questions as they related to issues around the
25	financial aspects of the application, in particular,

the --obviously the big issue of, do you do four? 1 2 you do some smaller number? Why isn?t that as 3 feasible as it might perhaps be in other settings? I think that discussion has been very much 4 flushed out and fattened up if you will to the point 5 where I would be comfortable with moving forward, Mr. 6 Chair. 7 CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Today? 8 MEMBER ETHERLY: Today. That is correct, 9 Mr. Chair. 10 11 But with that, let me speak to the Office 12 of Planning component. I entirely understand the position that I 13 14 believe Mr. Mordfin finds himself in or finds this particular subject property in, if you will regarding 15 16 the critical issue of that increased density. 17 The way in which I look at this, however, 18 is I think when you take in the totality, the project as I?s proposed, I still see something that is fairly 19 20 in step with what is happening in the surrounding 21 community. And I think the Applicant has done a very 2.2 persuasive job in my opinion of demonstrating that there is not a significant measure of harm that would 23 be done. And I?m not necessarily speaking in the 24

language of the test here. I?m just kind of very

broadly, at this particular juncture, that there would not necessarily be a great deal of harm done to the surrounding community by the introduction of this project as it is currently proposed into the neighborhood.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Thank you for that comment. Well said.

Others?

2.2

VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I?m not ready. I think I learned a lot today about this case but there?s area that I think that the Applicant could address better and that was when I was posing questions about the practical difficulty test and I?m sorry I don?t have the statute in front of me. But it?s my understanding that there needs to be a showing that there?s a practical difficulty that the owner has in complying with the area restriction that leads them to seek a variance.

I mean, all I have in front of me today is Palmer which just says generally it must be shown that compliance with the area restriction would be unnecessarily burdensome.

So, I think what I was hearing was like, you know, it was desirable to do something. And then

1	there was a practical difficulty in doing it another
2	way. And maybe the Applicant could address that
3	either that I?m not reading the test correctly or that
4	they can make the test that there is some difficulty
5	if they can?t get the area variances for some of them.
6	And I think that probably is the case because I heard
7	some difficulty even with respect to the elevator that
8	it might be very difficult to get up to the sixth
9	floor.
10	But I don?t think the case was made in the
11	pleadings.
12	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: I don?t understand.
13	And really I?m at a bit of a loss here. Because what
14	you?re saying is somehow there has to be a showing
15	that you?re forced to do what you?re here to do?
16	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: No. Not forced.
17	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: That?s exactly what you
18	said. You said, well, where is the practical
19	difficulty in having to do this? So, all these
20	additions that we see that come in for variances, some
21	how the land is telling them they have to add onto the
22	house. But in adding on, they need a variance.
23	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: No. That?s not
24	what I?m saying. I?m not saying that they have to do

I?m saying that they have to show that there?s

it.

	some difficulty if they don't do it.
2	For instance, they may not have to have
3	the elevator. But there may be a difficult if they
4	don?t have it.
5	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: I?d love to see a court
6	case or let?s start with the regulations that show it.
7	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Let?s start with
8	the statute, but I wishI don?t have it in front of
9	me which I usually do.
10	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: The regulations will
11	set to say, as the property is unique, what is it that
12	is a practically difficult in complying with the
13	regulations? Not
14	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: That?s correct.
15	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: what is it that
16	forced you to do this and, therefore, is not making
17	you able to comply with the regulation.
18	At some point there is an initiation of an
19	Applicantof an owner to do something. That
20	initiation doesn?t come out of the property requiring
21	it.
22	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I didn?t say
23	require. I said that there must be some practical
24	difficulty that the owner is going to experience if
25	they have to comply strictly with the regulation. And

1	I think that it?s
2	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Okay. Maybe I?m not
3	understanding what you?re saying then.
4	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay.
5	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Let?s use this specific
6	case of mine so I know what we?re asking for.
7	We have no parking requirement here.
8	Correct?
9	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Correct.
10	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Okay. However, a
11	parking pad wants to be provided. We have a site that
12	has an incredibly sloped rear so that parking, if not
13	impossible, is certainly practically difficult.
14	Right?
15	In order to provide that parking pad,
16	they?re putting a structure that is counted towards
17	lot occupancy which, therefore, makes them come in
18	from lot occupancy.
19	What?s theit seems to me you?re asking
20	them to show a motivation for providing that pad as
21	some of the practical difficulty. Is that correct?
22	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: I think we can
23	make the case for them right here.
24	When we do our analysis, we?ve got to fill
25	in those blanks and I mean I could guess right here

1	and say for instance with the parking. If there were
2	a zillion parking spaces on the street, then it might
3	be hard for them to say that there?s a practical
4	difficulty if they don?t have a parking pad behind.
5	You know, for instance.
6	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Say this developer
7	was
8	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Not just because
9	they want it.
10	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS:UPARK and owned every
11	surface parking in the city. Are you saying they
12	wouldn?t have a practical difficulty showing in order
13	to want to put a parking space on their property?
14	Why would he have to survey and show that
15	there?s a practical difficulty in requiringin having
16	to provide a parking space when we?re talking about ta
17	lot occupancy?
18	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: The way I read
19	the regulation is that they have to show a practical
20	difficulty upon the owner as to why they need to vary
21	from the requirement.
22	I don?t think it?s that difficult, but I
23	think that a showing has to be made.
24	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: I know. I don?t
25	disagree with you there, but I?m wondering what

showing you?re asking them to provide? The showing
that they?re saying it?s practically difficult to park
on a sloped rear yard. So, they create a level
parking pad. How is that? And the practical
difficulty of that is if you put a level parking pad
at the rear, it counts for lot occupancy. That?s the
testimony that they made for the case.
VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Well, they may
have it for the parking. Another one was the
elevator. And we were talking about that.
And I think in the papers, to have the
record correct, I think the papers. First they said
it was required was code and then they said, no. It?s
really not. So, why do they have to have awhy
what?s the need? What?s the need they?re fulfilling?
CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: I guess that?s the
question.
VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: What?s the
practical difficulty if they don?t have an elevator?
I don?t think it?s that difficult to, you know,
address.
CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Right.
VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: But I think it
has to be addressed.
CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: I don?t think so. I

1	think you?re asking them to prove practical difficulty
2	twice. You?re asking them. Show me the practical
3	difficulty for even proposing this and then let?s go
4	to the practical difficulty of what is in the
5	requirement.
6	You?re telling me that there has to be a
7	showing that they need the elevator?
8	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Not that they
9	need it. That they don?t
10	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: That it?s practically
11	difficult to live without it?
12	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: If they don?t
13	have it there?s some practical difficulty that they?ll
14	experience.
15	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Let me see if I
16	understand.
17	When we have these rear deck additions, do
18	we ask themhow hard would your life be without? Is
19	that first that they tell them? Is that the first
20	requirement?
21	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: No. The first
22	is the exceptional condition.
23	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: And then we ask them,
24	do you really need this deck? And if you really need
25	it. Okay. Then let?s get to well why is it
	1

149
practically difficult not to build it in compliance
with the zoning regulations?
It seems like you?re asking two
VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: No.
CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: practical difficulty
tests.
VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: No. I?m not
even asking them. It?s not even need. It?s what is
the difficulty? I don?t think it?s too difficult
CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: So, let?s take it to
the elevator. All right. I don?t think it?s
CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: So, let?s take it to
the elevator.
Do you needis there has to be a showing
of why it?s practically difficult to not have the
elevator here?
VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER:
MR. KEARLEY: I think we answered that in
some ways because of theI think we answered that and
specifically when you?re talking about the number of
stories in the particular unit. That particular unit
is actually five stories. It starts at the first
floor and goes all the way up to the fifth floor. So,
if you?re talking about a practical difficulty of not

having the elevator, you?re in a residence which is

25

1	five stories, which is very unusual, if not unheard
2	of.
3	So, when you?re talking about someone?s
4	parents living there and having the necessity of
5	having that, so I think we have addressed that in some
6	ways.
7	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Let me interrupt you
8	because what we?re talking about here is an addition.
9	I don?t care if the edition is filled with an
10	elevator or it?smaybe it?s the biggest laundry
11	shoot going. What do we care what the use of it is of
12	what?s being proposed?
13	What I?m hearing you ask is, an additional
14	test. Now, they?re putting an addition on a
15	nonconforming building. The elevator was going into a
16	closed port, where I think it is at the property line
17	through walls. The closed court counted for his lot
18	occupancy already. But the mere fact that it?s an
19	addition to a nonconforming, sets you in.
20	MR. COLLINS: I didn?t know this was a
21	discussion or what, but if I can just chime in.
22	There?s a three-part test. The property
23	is affected by an exceptional situation or condition.
24	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Yes.
25	MR. COLLINS: Such that the strict

application of the regulations would 1 impose 2 practical difficulty. 3 CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Right. MR. COLLINS: We seem to be talking about 4 5 just the first two parts of the three-part test. 6 CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: That?s right. 7 MR. COLLINS: On the parking, we have an absolute right to park on the site. There?s no 8 requirement that we have to show a need to park or 9 that we don?t show that the zoning requirements--the 10 11 zoning regulations require that we park. 12 absolutely allowed to park. 13 The practical difficulty comes in how do 14 we do that? How do we do that parking on the site? We either put a 15 We do it in one of several ways. 16 garage doors in front of the building, because we 17 can?t park in the front yard. That?s public space. We have to put a garage door in front of the building 18 and drive in the front. Or we have to park in the 19 20 back. 21 We can?t park in the back because the site 22 That?s the practical difficulty. The sloping site, the existing historic building. That?s the 23 combination of the practical difficulty here. 24

VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Maybe we should

25

Τ	Just have a give and take a little bit and we won!t
2	need to have any filings.
3	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Okay.
4	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: But what isyou
5	don?t have to park. If you have a practical
6	difficulty in providing a parking space. Correct?
7	What?s your practical difficulty if you don?t provide
8	that? To me, that?s the question.
9	MR. COLLINS: That?s not the test. The
10	test is
11	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: I don?t think it?s
12	anywhere in the regulation.
13	MR. COLLINS: due to an exceptional
14	situation or condition affecting the property, the
15	strict application of the regulation would impose a
16	practical difficulty.
17	Strict application of the regulation says,
18	you can park in a side yard or rear yard.
19	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Oh, that?s
20	MR. COLLINS: Or inside a building.
21	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay.
22	MR. COLLINS: So, we can?t park inside the
23	building because you can only access that from the
24	front.
25	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: There you go. I

1	got it.
2	MR. COLLINS: Okay.
3	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Strict
4	application says you can park in those places but you
5	can?t?
6	MR. COLLINS: But we can?t.
7	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay. That?s
8	it.
9	MR. COLLINS: And then just let me go on
10	for the elevator just to clarify that situation.
11	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Okay.
12	MR. COLLINS: We don?t have to prove that
13	we need an elevator.
14	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: No. I never
15	said that.
16	MR. COLLINS: No. I know you didn?t say
17	that, but there?s been some unclarity in some
18	statements that were made by us. But, no. We know
19	that variances aren?t personal to the Applicant.
20	But we know that the strict application
21	of the regulations here for the elevator is that the
22	building is already a nonconforming structure. And we
23	are putting an addition to it, even though this hole
24	in the building, this closed court, hole in the

building is there and already counts lot occupancy.

1	In a discussion with the Zoning
2	Administrator, even though this is a self-certified
3	case, we discussed this with the zoning office before
4	we filed to get their concurrence of what the areas of
5	relief are. And they said. Yes. It?s a closed
6	court. It?s lot occupancy, but if you put something
7	in it, you?re adding to the building.
8	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: So, if you put a closet
9	in there, would you have to show us
10	MR. COLLINS: Yes.
11	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: why you needed more
12	closets?
13	MR. COLLINS: No.
14	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Or would you come in
15	for an addition to a nonconforming structure?
16	MR. COLLINS: We?d come in for an addition
17	on the nonconforming structure.
18	So, the practical difficulty in the
19	elevator comes in, in that we could jackhammer five
20	slabs and put the elevator within the floors as long
21	as you stayed outsidewe didn?t fill in the court or
22	put it on the outside of the building somewhere, as
23	long as you stayed within the existing building
24	footprint, we could put an elevator in. And that
25	would not be an enlargement of the structure.

1	An enlargement of the structure comes
2	because we?re puttingwe?re filling in the hole.
3	That?s the enlargement of the structure. So, the
4	strict application of the regulations imposing a
5	practical difficulty is the practical difficulty is
6	that we have two choices. One is to jackhammer five
7	slabs down and put the elevator in or chop off half
8	the building, make it a nonconforming structure and be
9	able to put the elevator in the courtin the hole in
10	the closed court. That?s our practical difficulty in
11	that.
12	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Good.
13	VICE CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Thank you.
14	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: We have no more than 20
15	minutes. However, we have to take a technical five-
16	minute break for the reporter and then we?ll be back.
17	Let?s go.
18	(Whereupon, off the record from 4:51 p.m.
19	to 5:04 p.m.)
20	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Very well, let?s
21	resume.
22	We?re going to set this for decision-
23	making as we?ve had some information come in today.
24	We?re going to keep the record open for a supplemental
25	report from the Office of Planning if they are so

1	inclined.
2	Let me just take an assessment of whether
3	it would be possible to get that in in seven days?
4	Realistic?
5	MR. MORPHIN: By next Tuesday.
6	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Have it in by next
7	Tuesday?
8	Mr. Collins, we?re going to give you a
9	week to respond to that. Very well. In which case
LO	we?ll set that up for decision, Mr. Moy on the
11	following Tuesday. What would that be?
L2	SECRETARY MOY: October 4.
L3	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: It?s going to be the
L4	week after the fourth actually, I believe. Good. So,
L5	it would be on the 11th we?d put this for.
L6	Oh, it?s all wrong. Let?s do it on the
L7	18th shall we?
L8	MR. COLLINS: Let me just clarify
L9	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: Right.
20	MR. COLLINS: Any response that we have
21	would be due the 11th and the decision on the 18th?
22	Or a decision on the 11th?
23	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: We?re going to do it on
24	the 18th, as we have some things on the 11th already.
25	If we do a Special Public, the other option would be

1	that we just move it to the 1st of November. But I
2	think we can dispense with this on the 18th.
3	It does give us a little additional time.
4	Do you think they?re going to need more than seven
5	days to get this in? We can give you a day or two
6	more. We could do Wednesday by 3:00.
7	MR. MORPHIN: Okay.
8	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: And then we?d move you
9	to that Wednesday 3:00.
10	MR. COLLINS: Okay.
11	CHAIRMAN GRIFFIS: And that gives us
12	enough time to get this out to the Board for decision
13	on the 18th.
14	Okay. Anything else, Board Members? Any
15	other additional information that we want provided
16	into the record?
17	Very well. I didn?t take note of any
18	others unless the staff is aware of anything else?
19	Good. Then the schedule is, I can
20	reiterate that or is everyone clear on schedule?
21	Excellent. So, we?ll have that in and
22	we?ll go from there.
23	Good. Thank you all very much.
24	Appreciate you being with us today and if there?s no
25	other business for the Board this afternoon, let?s

	158
1	adjourn the afternoon session.
2	(Whereupon, the above matter was concluded
3	at 5:07 p.m.)
4	
5	